OE FORM 6000, 2/69

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

ERIC REPORT RESUME

ERIC ACC. NO. ED 029 169			
CH ACC. NO. AA 000 359	P.A.	PUBL. DATE 67	ISSUE RIEOCT69

IS DOCUMENT COPYRIGHTED? YES ☐ NO ☒

ERIC REPRODUCTION RELEASE? YES ☐ NO ☐

LEVEL OF AVAILABILITY I ☒ II ☐ III ☐

AUTHOR
Lynton, Edith F.

TITLE
The Subprofessional - From Concept to Careers.

SOURCE CODE QPX56475	INSTITUTION (SOURCE) National Committee on Employment of Youth, New York, N.Y.
SP. AG. CODE RMQ66000	SPONSORING AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.

EDRS PRICE 0.75;9.35	CONTRACT NO.	GRANT NO. OEG-1-7-070095-2869
REPORT NO.		BUREAU NO. BR-7-0095

AVAILABILITY

JOURNAL CITATION

DESCRIPTIVE NOTE

185p.

DESCRIPTORS
*Subprofessionals; *Health Occupations; Teacher Aides; *Paraprofessional School Personnel; Welfare; *Welfare Services; Conferences; *Career Opportunities; Employment Opportunities

IDENTIFIERS

ABSTRACT

A conference was conducted which had as its prime purpose the consideration of how to move the employment of subprofessionals from concept to greater actuality in the fields of health, education, and welfare. This report consists of a summary of the discussions that took place in the course of the meeting, an evaluation of the conclusions reached in those discussions, and the recommendations for the next steps to be taken for advancing the use of subprofessionals in the human-service occupations. In addition, the report contains advance papers prepared for the participants, summaries of the individual workshop sessions, the texts of presentations by panelists during plenary sessions, and the list of those who attended. (JL)

GPO 870-390

ED029169

THE SUBPROFESSIONAL

From Concepts to Careers

by
Edith F. Lynton

National Committee on Employment of Youth

AA000359

THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OF YOUTH was organized in 1959, when it became clear that the increasing proportion of young people of employment age in the population would have the serious problems they are now experiencing in the labor market. NCEY is the only national, nongovernmental, nonprofit agency concentrating exclusively on the difficulties youth face in preparing for, finding, and adjusting to employment.

The agency assists local and national programs offering guidance and placement, training, work experience, and education. It helps them to develop and strengthen services and to devise new approaches. It monitors and influences policies and programs, and provides a forum for the discussion of issues related to youth and work. NCEY conducts studies, operates a clearinghouse for information, offers consultation, trains staff, issues publications and reports, conducts conferences, and operates demonstration programs.

NCEY is an operating division of the National Child Labor Committee, which was founded in 1904 to fight against the exploitation of children in industry and agriculture and for free, public education. In 1907 NCLC was granted a charter of incorporation by Congress. In 1963 the agency set up the National Committee on the Education of Migrant Children, a program which addresses itself to this most serious remaining segment of the child labor problem.

THE SUBPROFESSIONAL

FROM CONCEPTS TO CAREERS

by
Edith F. Lynton

**A Report of a Conference to Expand and Develop
Subprofessional Roles in Health, Education and Welfare
Under a grant from the U. S. Office of Education**

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Conducted by the
NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OF YOUTH

145 East 32nd Street, New York, N. Y. September 30th, 1967

FOREWORD

High among the objectives of the National Committee on Employment of Youth is providing young people with sufficient employment opportunity of adequate quality to meet their individual needs for personal development, as well as the needs of the nation for a strong labor force. Our long experience with the difficulties young people encounter in preparing for, finding, and adjusting to work has convinced us that at this time in this country there is not enough work opportunity that fulfills these national and individual requirements. Many youth job problems will not be solved, we feel, until such opportunity is created. This conviction, and our analysis of the labor market, led us to the conclusion that the best potential for creating the numbers and kinds of jobs needed now, and that will be needed in the foreseeable future, lies in the vast reservoir of unmet need throughout the population for human services, principally health, education, and welfare.

To provide such expanded services, and the jobs that the expansion could create, commits us to the development of the subprofessional service role in new patterns of service as well as the existing ones. We feel that subprofessional models can, if properly designed and implemented, make possible the needed service and job expansion without undermining or diluting service quality. However, putting this highly sophisticated employment model into widespread use has been a difficult task.

Under a grant from the United States Office of Education we conducted a conference which had as its prime purpose the consideration of how to move the employment of subprofessionals from concept to greater actuality in the fields of health, education, and welfare. The conference was held from June 22 to June 24, 1967, at the Tappan Zee Motor Inn, in Nyack, New York. It was attended by sixty-six participants, chosen for their leadership and experience in their respective fields.

What follows is the report of that conference. It consists of a summary of the discussions that took place in the course of the meeting, an evaluation of the conclusions reached in those discussions, and our recommendations for the next steps to be taken for advancing the use of subprofessionals in the human-service occupations. In addition, the report contains advance papers prepared for the participants, summaries of the individual workshop sessions, the texts of presentations by panelists during plenary sessions, and the list of those who attended.

We wish to express our thanks to the Office of Education's Division of Adult and Vocational Research for making this conference possible, and to Bernard M. Yabroff and Robert Herman, of the division's Employment Opportunities Branch, for their valuable assistance in planning the conference. We are grateful also to the many leaders in health, education, and welfare, too numerous to mention individually, who contributed their time and experience to the planning of the conference and the selection of the participants. Finally, we express our gratitude to the conference participants who took time from their over-extended schedules, some of them traveling across the country, without whom this conference could not have been effective.

Above all, the contribution of two individuals stood out. Edith F. Lynton, who prepared this report, was responsible for the planning and organization of the conference and the preparation of the advance papers. Joel Seldin, NCEY's Associate Executive Secretary, provided leadership and assistance in many ways to the conference staff.

Eli E. Cohen
Executive Secretary

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

SUMMARY, EVALUATION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A Definition 2
Why The Conference? 3
Conceptual Problems 8
Toward Developing Models 13
The Obstacles to Subprofessional Careers 17
The Issues of Supply 30
Where Do We Go From Here? 36
The Panel: Isadore Tuerk, M.D. 37
Carl Dolce 40
William H. Robinson 44
The Discussion Afterward 49
Recommendations 54

THE SUBPROFESSIONAL SCENE

Advance Papers for the Conference:

Current Levels of Understanding 67
The Current Status of Permanent Subprofessional Employment 78
Education and Careers in Human Service 87
The Community Action Program Model 95
Selected Models of Subprofessional Careers 105

THE WORKSHOPS

Address, Dr. Eli Ginzberg
Revolution in Service Employment 123
Workshops I: The Fullest Use of Subprofessionals in Health, Education and Welfare 128
Workshops II: The Changes Needed, and the Obstacles to Change .. 138
Workshops III: Overcoming the Obstacles 149
Workshops IV: Recruiting, Selecting, and Developing Subprofessionals 165

CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS 173

RECENT PUBLICATIONS BY NCEY 177

SUMMARY, EVALUATION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A DEFINITION

The title subprofessional has as yet no clear and consistent meaning. Moreover, it is used interchangeably with other titles: nonprofessional, new careerist, aide, assistant, and many others. Subprofessional, we believe, while not perfect, is preferable to nonprofessional because it connotes a relationship with professional activity rather than the absence of professional status; new careerist, as a title, has no necessary connection with professions. A superior title is still in the offing. For the present, subprofessional is a working title, defined by the following principal characteristics:

> Subprofessional jobs consist of sub-sections of work, heretofore done by professionals, for which full professional training is not necessary, or of new functions that expand the scope of professional service.
>
> The jobs are designed at the entry level so that persons with less than the training or the academic credentials that usually accompany professional status can, in relatively short periods, become sufficiently skilled to perform the work.
>
> The jobs allow opportunity for individual development, regardless of traditional credentials or other arbitrary symbols of status, and permit advancement to duties of greater challenge and responsibility.
>
> Advancement is accompanied by increments of earnings and access to promotional avenues which are not dependent exclusively on full-time formal training financed by the individual.

Although clerical and custodial functions may be included in subprofessional jobs, these functions alone do not constitute a subprofessional work level. Such functions meet the subprofessional definition when they are either a work component integral to the service functions, or designed as an entry level from which advancement is both planned and provided.

The absence of rigid hiring requirements based on credentials does not imply the absence of selection criteria. The criteria used, however, should be distinctly related to the work to be performed. Similarly, promotion should depend on evaluation of performance and accreditation of relevant training and experience rather than length of service, number of years in school, or other arbitrary standards.

The requirement of opportunities for upgrading does not necessarily imply a complete continuum from subprofessional entry to full professional status, nor does it mean that every subprofessional will automatically advance. It signifies only the planned upgrading of those who merit promotion on the basis of performance. There is the expectation that for some, subprofessional work may lead to entry into a profession, but for others, new avenues of advancement may parallel professionalism. Subprofessional employment should not be designed primarily as a device for recruiting professionals.

WHY THE CONFERENCE?

The sponsors and planners of this conference sought principally to stimulate action so that subprofessional careers in the human services -- health, education, and welfare -- could move from theory to actuality. They sought action by employing agencies working either singly or in concert; either locally or at the national level. They sought quality in the action as much as, if not more than, numbers of jobs. They wanted to increase the number of real subprofessionals, but to increase them in a planned and directed manner, in order to contribute to the development of a productive new form of employment. Only such a development, the sponsors and planners were convinced, could satisfy operation needs in the service fields, enrich and expand the services offered, and provide career opportunities for the subprofessionals.

The use of service subprofessionals has been, in theory at least, gaining broader acceptance. It is seen as an answer to manpower needs, as a way of closing the gap between the services offered and the needs of the population, and as a more rational use of human resources for the reduction of unemployment and poverty, Nevertheless, there has not been enough significant, concrete implementation of the theory. The attention of legislators, planners, and administrators has, as a result, been shifting from whether to employ such workers to how to employ them.

Establishing new work roles related to professional service functions has proven much more difficult than was anticipated, although the general principle has been endorsed by some managers, civil-service commissions, labor unions, and professional associations. A number of jobs have been set up and labeled subprofessional, but few have incorporated the training, status, advancement potential, and pay that are considered the critical elements of a truly subprofessional job. Instead, the jobs have been low-paying dead-ends, with high rates of turnover and too low a skill level to satisfy staffing needs. Meanwhile, professional shortages become more acute. Such obstacles as line budgets, administrative regulations, collective bargaining agreements, licensing statutes, and the policies of professional associations have been major impediments to the creation of true subprofessionals. Education and training resources and methods have been inadequate.

It was to this gamut of problems, seemingly insoluble even for the most willing employers, that this conference was addressed. Employers, therefore, were asked to be the major participating group. The primary conference question was: "How can the manpower needs of employers be met by subprofessionals? How can the subprofessional needs for satisfactory careers be met by employers?"

To the extent that employment is an equation of supply and demand, the question concentrated on demand, and the emphasis was deliberate. Most experiments with subprofessionals have concentrated on supply -- on developing people to be subprofessionals. Most of the knowledge gained has concerned the availability and ability of people once thought unsuited to most kinds of employment because they did not conform to the prevailing culture, lacked education credentials, or did not have a license or some other arbitrary qualifications for working in service tasks that have become the exclusive prerogative of professionals. But this knowledge could not be put to optimal use because the "demand" for subprofessionals -- the design of jobs and careers -- had not been sufficiently refined in terms of the realities of the requirements of service employers and of the implementation of job models.

The Issues

Within this general focus, three major groups of issues were to be considered. The first concerned how subprofessionals should be employed. Should a teacher aide, for instance, or a nurse's aide, be a handmaiden to an individual teacher or nurse, or could the employment of auxiliary personnel become a stimulus for a new and improved division of labor in education, or in health? Could subprofessionals relate to the changing emphasis in public welfare from determinations of eligibility to the provision of a broad range of direct services? How might achievements in the health occupations be consolidated and redirected to expand services and lend continuity to careers?

The second issue-complex consisted of the internal and external arrangements needed for establishing subprofessional service careers. What changes were needed in budgeting, in personnel policies and practices, and in the positions taken by professionals? What modifications were required in existing statutes, and what new legislation was needed? What obstacles in civil-service structure and union agreements needed to be overcome? What steps could be taken and by whom to break down the barriers to effective manpower innovation? Where were the funds to come from?

Only after considering such questions were the conferees to go on to the third set of issues, which involved the supply of subprofessionals. Even then, only those supply questions that related directly to the implementation of subprofessional job models were on the agenda. These included problems inherent in recruiting, selecting, and training candidates appropriate for the anticipated tasks, as well as in the roles to be played in subprofessional development by secondary and vocational schools, junior colleges, or totally new facilities.

Concepts and Models

Since the primary objective of the conference was to stimulate action on service careers for subprofessionals, the immediate task became that of developing the plans for such action. It was quickly recongnized that this would require, on the part of the planners, a full understanding of both the immediate and the long-term implications of their decisions. The disparity between the theoretical conceptions of subprofessionals and the realities of the initial efforts to create jobs for them suggested that a conceptual base needed to be developed and refined.

The theoretical conception of the subprofessionals has been evolving. Rather than temporary expedients for solving manpower shortages, or as recipients of stop-gap employment opportunities created exclusively for the poor, they are beginning to be viewed as a major, permanent resource for long-range manpower needs and the job needs of the population. This expanded and more positive view is, however, very recent and has proven most difficult to put into practice. The difficulty encountered in trying to find examples of significant productivity and enough advancement opportunity to warrant being termed a career potential, even among the small numbers of existing jobs called subprofessional, testifies to the restricted impact of this newer conception.

It has been observable that theoretical discussions of the potential of subprofessionals have thus far been confined for the most part to academic circles or to the planners and staffs of specially-funded programs, primarily those with Federal support. Administrators of major employing institutions and those with important influence or control over the policies of such institutions have seldom been included in the discussions. As a result, the theoretical base for subprofessional employment has most often been expressed in broad generalities and not addressed to specific service tasks or manpower shortages. The theories and models have not been focused on the actual systems within which the major employers operate, or on the concerns of vested interests within those systems. It is hardly surprising, then, that the major employers have not adopted the theories or the models. One major objective of the conference was to involve such employers in an effort to redefine or expand the conceptual base of the subprofessional role to make these models more relevant to what the employers recognize as their needs.

Because they have not been constrained by the limitations and pressures usual in public or quasi-public service employment, the planners of special programs have had unusual freedom and flexibility both in design and in operations. However, much that they have learned in the development of these special programs, particularly in those under anti-poverty auspices, remains a separate body of knowledge with little applicability for the bulk of the human-service sector. This has been true even when representatives of established institutions have been included in the development of job designs for subprofessionals or the training of subprofessional workers. The objective too often has been job creation for the poor, and the appeal has been on the basis of humanitarianism rather than on worker effectiveness. As humanitarians, employers have responded with help for the special programs, which produced temporary and make-work jobs. As employers, they have not considered it to their interest to engage the workers produced by the very programs with which they cooperated.

According to Dr. James G. Haughton, First Deputy Health Services Administrator of New York City, this was illustrated as recently as August 2, 1967 by the New York Times, which reported that "1,000 persons trained with anti-poverty funds for jobs as health aides have been unable to find employment, despite the critical shortage of health personnel...the programs were conducted by hospitals under contract with the anti-poverty agencies."

The Participants

As mentioned earlier, the conference participants were for the most part invited from among potential employers of service subprofessionals. National leaders in the three service fields, selected for the scope of their understanding of manpower and service considerations in their specialty and for their influence on policy, were the target group. In addition, invitations were sent to key persons in professional associations, civil service, unions, relevant government posts, and institutions that have been studying or experimenting with the subprofessional.

It was a working conference, not an audience for speakers. In plenary sessions and in small workshop groups they shared experiences and insights to help each other create new and interdisciplinary patterns. Before the conference they received a series of papers, included in this report, that summarized basic current manpower data about subprofessionals in the three service fields. As a result they had, in addition to their personal knowledge and experience, a common fund of information and a common frame of reference for their discussions.

They were as eager as the conference planners to address the problems of developing realistic policies and procedures for the adoption of subprofessional models in regular service employment. As one of them said: "Top executives seldom have more than 10 minutes a month to consider this important topic." Even more rarely, others indicated, did they have an opportunity to confer on this subject with colleagues in other cities or states. And virtually never did they have contact with their counterparts in other human services, even within the same community. Meetings involving management, unions, civil service, budget bureaus, and legislative bodies, they said, generally are confined to the specifics of the latest crisis. An administrator's contact with the educators and associations of professionals, they noted, focuses usually on exclusively professional considerations, to the exclusion of subprofessional ones.

The group assembled for the conference constituted a new mix of capability and interest -- one which recognized that the creation of careers for subprofessionals was a complex of divergent viewpoints. At the same time, they were able to appreciate that the major issues, although varying in detail, basically were common to all the human services. Interested as they were, they began their discussions tentatively. Gradually they became more cohesive, and they concluded with what they agreed among themselves was a successful meeting. After three days of intensive discussion, Dr. Isadore Tuerk, Maryland's commissioner of mental health, said in the course of the closing session: "In this conference we went through a good deal of struggle, a good deal of opposition, resistance, and negativism, but eventually out of it came a resolution and a positive spirit."

The Expectations

It was hoped that the conference would have three possible outcomes. The first was that those who participated would, as a group, clarify and expand their own understanding of subprofessional employment and draft some of the practical measures needed for putting into practice this new and refined understanding. It appeared likely that in the process of contending with the issues and the problems they would reach some agreements. While not all conflicts would be resolved, the differences would be better identified, so that the conferees could suggest steps toward resolving the differences.

The second desired outcome was that they would themselves initiate actions to expand the employment of real subprofessionals or facilitate such employment by others. They might also be stimulated to move alone, or with others, to extend the discussion beyond the conference. An attractive possibility was that some, as a result of their participation in the conference, would become leaders in the development of careers for subprofessionals.

Finally, it was anticipated that, if all worked well, the proceedings of the conference would serve as the basis for a series of recommendations for activity in many directions, and would thus become a document of value to employers and planners in the human services. The recommendations, it was expected, would go beyond the employment policy of a particular service agency and include needed research and demonstrations, technical assistance, changes in legislation and in administrative policies locally and nationally, and the development of formal or informal coalitions for resolving the questions underlying barriers created by conflicting interests.

Even if this proved too ambitious, it was felt, the record -- this report -- would be a valuable guide to those who continue the effort to expand and make meaningful the human services and their employment structure. For even if the conceptions underlying the rationale of this conference should, as a result of the meeting, or of subsequent developments, turn out to have been faulty, these errors, if sufficiently publicized and understood, will help to develop long overdue, much needed changes in traditional employment practices in the human services.

CONCEPTUAL PROBLEMS

Throughout the workshops and plenary sessions there were some recurrent themes which by their nature and frequency gave evidence of the need for clarifying fundamental conceptual issues. Three such primary issues were the term subprofessional itself, the career concept, and the goals of subprofessional employment. The persistence of these themes and the tenor of the discussion of them confirmed the complexities of the issues and the limitations of applicable knowledge, even in sophisticated circles. It became clear that, without fuller understanding and at least tentative agreement on those topics, little planned, significant innovation in the use of subprofessionals could be anticipated.

One repetitive concern was with the title subprofessional. There were some who deemed it opprobrious and who called for a different title. Although many other titles were reviewed, no single one was satisfactory. More important was the lack of a clear and consistent usage. At the outset, there were some who referred to janitors, clerks, indeed every category of uncertified, unlicensed, non-college-graduate staff, as subprofessionals. But in the interchanges within the groups the word subprofessional ultimately was accepted as describing, for service occupations, only those jobs that relate directly to human contacts that arise in providing services. Clerical, custodial, and similar jobs were excluded unless they were part of a subprofessional job ladder. On the other hand, association with service functions, it was agreed, should be construed broadly to include all jobs that are a part of the special interpersonal relationships characteristic of a service agency. Thus, administrative and technical services could be subsumed under the title subprofessional.

Admittedly, this is a vague definition of an unsatisfactory term. But the discontent with semantics was probably correctly diagnosed when it was seen as symptomatic of a general dissatisfaction with the menial nature of most allegedly subprofessional jobs that now exist. The conferees became aware that when the subprofessional is a low-level appendage to professionals, it is difficult to dignify his work with a name. Thus, the discussion of the job title moved from a purely semantic concern to the conviction that jobs for subprofessionals must have greater independent content and integrity.

The term careers as applied to subprofessionals was another area of confusion and disagreement. Here, the problem was less semantic and more conceptual. Nursing, teaching, and social work are careers, but what changes in subprofessional jobs are needed to transform them into careers? This question was discussed by each group in relation to the specific conditions of each field, but it became apparent that there were central issues that beclouded the matter for all. Whether work is or is not a career, it appeared, is dependent on the degree of responsibility allowed to the worker, his status, and his rate of pay. For the subprofessional, who commonly carries little or no responsibility, what increments of pay and status can be deemed career opportunities? For all groups the problem was whether to consider moving the subprofessional along the tracks that now exist, or creating new tracks. In all fields it was clear that providing the subprofessional a career through promotion means allowing him to assume, at present, the subprofessional role, or at least some part of traditional professional responsiibility.

On the basis of existing occupational patterns, some saw as a major necessity a completely open promotional pathway to full professional standing. Only this, they felt, would constitute a satisfying career. Anything less, they feared, would result in a caste system in which particular individuals would be permanently subprofessional. Others rejected this view as unrealistic, asserting that most of those who work as subprofessionals neither aim to become nor are capable of becoming full professionals. Still others concluded that both viewpoints err in assuming that the present hierarchy is final. They saw the need to redefine all levels of work, including the professional. The majority view appeared to encompass and to some extent reconcile the differences.

The standard of complete upward mobility was recognized as a potential ideal, and one toward which efforts should be made. But to require that the entire subprofessional job structure provide steps toward ultimate professional status would, they thought, restrict subprofessional opportunities to potential professional recruits. To believe that most subprofessionals will not advance means accepting as final the realities of current employment, even though the majority recognized that, for some, subprofessional levels will be terminal, irrespective of new policies and procedures. Therefore, they felt efforts must be made to secure a basic living wage for subprofessionals with some increments for experience and increased proficiency.

The essential issue, however, became the need to consider, develop, and test improved models, which provided more gradations bridging current occupational gaps or entirely new pathways that move from entry to some newly created occupational specialty. The group as a whole, in attempting to construct theoretical career models, tended to oscillate between the two poles of improving current structures and of creating entirely new ones. Underlying both, however, was the problem of envisioning career progression that was not tied to precise levels of educational attainment.

The relation of education to careers, a subject discussed in an advance paper, is a sensitive and difficult question. On this point alone, the divergences of view were perhaps the sharpest. Some believed that assuring promotional opportunities to subprofessionals without traditional education requirements constituted a challenge that threatened the entire foundation of the professions. Because this concept runs counter to the major professional concern with upgrading the professions, some participants felt that any relaxation of professional requirements would mean a regression detrimental to professional service. Others, however, suggested that the relationship of education to competent performance has been assumed but never proven, and that there must be other ways to adduce competence. This position was weakened by an inability to suggest alternate methods for determining competence. Reliable and objective measures of skill are lacking, as are methods of accrediting experience in occupations, other than purely technical specialties in health. Without such measures, a career sequence can be constructed only by subjective ratings or by automatic promotion based on length of service, neither of which appeared adequate. New measures are particularly difficult to devise in fields that themselves characteristically set few work standards and resist evaluation.

Discussion of career design succeeded more in exposing the issues and the points of resistance than in providing absolute answers. But it provoked a questioning attitude, receptive to the need for more knowledge and for action based on the best empirical judgments. If education alone is not a satisfactory measure, then, in one member's opinion, much experimentation must be directed toward developing better, or at least equivalent, techniques to serve as criteria for advancement. If education is to remain an important criterion, then, others concluded, the means must be sought to make such education more accessible.

At most, what came out of this discussion was a narrowing of the distance between viewpoints. All were willing to accept the formulation that a subprofessional career did not imply guaranteed advancement of all subprofessionals to higher levels of work, but only an assurance of opportunity for some upgrading, provided they could qualify. Giving substance to such a concept demands one or more of three elements: the identification of the qualities and skills needed for particular jobs and the development of measures to ascertain who has them; the availability of upgrading and training mechanisms other than academic curricula; and, perhaps, the design of new career lines that do not invade specific professional territory. Possibly most significant was the recognition that a subprofessional career was not automatically created by segmenting out some professional tasks for assignment to lesser trained persons.

Despite the imprecise manner in which the career concept was formulated, it was this concept itself that many participants, and especially the administrators of large state or municipal systems, found most significant. As one said: "We are already committed to the use of subprofessionals. But from what I have learned at the conference I see possibilities for expanding their use. I think I am going to have to worry about one thing I have never worried about until I came here -- and that is this career ladders business. It never occurred to me that we had to consider movement upward for subprofessionals." Many others volunteered that subprofessional jobs within their organizations needed critical appraisal in order to determine possibilities for upgrading. They said that they would consider any new job in terms of its longer-range career implications. They were aware of the complexities of constructing viable career lines, but as practical people they were most often of the opinion that some positive steps could be taken without a total resolution of all the abstractions. While it might be of immediate value to create some jobs of limited opportunity, they would no longer accept such jobs as complete and final, but would work to open up deadends wherever and whenever possible.

The ability to accept and apply a concept of subprofessional careers clearly relates to understanding the goals of subprofessional employment. If subprofessionals are used will standards of good practice be maintained? How does subprofessional employment relate to anti-poverty considerations? These recurrent questions proved to be fundamental, making it increasingly clear that the design of subprofessional jobs is determined, to a large extent, by the objectives of those who shape manpower policies. When subprofessionals are seen as an expedient, made necessary by shortages of professionals, then the jobs usually are inherently temporary and the least important and demanding ones in the judgment of the professionals. When the subprofessional concept is equated with providing jobs for the poor, the jobs are similarly limited in scope and temporary or makework, because the emphasis is on income for the worker, with job integrity a secondary consideration. And from both points of view, job creation is most often restricted to attempts to fit subprofessional jobs into or around the existing structures.

To operate on either premise is to confuse the question of appropriate design of jobs with the attributes of those who are expected to fill them. The process then becomes one of developing a job for untrained, undereducated people. Much of the difficulty in envisioning subprofessional careers undoubtedly stems from this mingling of questions of demand and supply. Management and professionals alike find it difficult to conceive of a subtantial employment potential for those not typically associated with high levels of education.

Many in key positions in health, education, and welfare often continue to consider subprofessionals primarily, if not exclusively, a temporary manpower measure. Because subprofessionals have been used as expedients and offered little training or incentive towards more productive work, experience with subprofessionals has tended to reinforce this negative view. The public is aware that aides are used in place of registered nurses at critical posts in municipal hospitals, that classrooms are staffed by permanent substitute teachers, and that subprofessionals in the public employ have been used largely in services for the poor. As one participant said: "There is a need for a major psychological change in attitude before those who are nonprofessionals can be accepted as something more than a poor substitute."

It is likely that some of the strong resistance on the part of teacher groups, or public welfare caseworkers, to the introduction or expansion of the use of subprofessionals stems from viewing them as low-cost substitutes. The conference's conclusion was that without the conviction that subprofessionals are a manpower resource with potential for extending the range and quality of services, there would be only low-paid, deadend subprofessional jobs, albeit in increasing numbers. As one school superintendent said: "If we sell subprofessionals as jobs for the poor or some help for the teacher, they will be used only in limited roles."

After considerable discussion, it was the almost unanimous opinion that to "sell" employment of subprofessionals as an anti-poverty strategy would be likewise incorrect on at least two counts. First, large service organizations are not geared to offer employment or training on the basis of need, except through the use of special and outside funds. While they may endorse job creation for the poor as a social policy, they do not necessarily see it as consistent with their primary management and service responsibilities. And second, such an approach could contribute to a caste system of employment, with subprofessional jobs reserved for the poor to serve the poor, which is increasingly coming to mean the minorities.

A sounder approach is to advance the creation of subprofessional careers as a basic manpower strategy aimed at providing the full service needs of the total community. Such a manpower approach is not inconsistent with anti-poverty goals, but different only in emphasis. The pressure to provide for the needs of the poor, plus the realities of a tight labor market, led to the recognition that opening paths to subprofessional careers for appropriate candidates among the poor would be, of necessity, a high priority within the strategy. But the employment of the poor would proceed not from a need to employ the poor because they are poor, but because some among them can, if offered appropriate opportunities, become part of a more rational use of total human resources for the purpose of meeting the whole society's urgent need for services and more employment opportunities.

By the close of the conference, the participants recognized the need to advocate this approach through what one of them called a "hard-sell campaign based on convincing data." They were aware that such data, if available, have not been widely disseminated, and that additional data are needed. The most convincing evidence would arise from the formulation and testing of models that meet both manpower and service needs, and guidelines for their implementation within the existing or needed organizational structures in public human-service employment.

TOWARD DEVELOPING MODELS

Designing a model that promises the fullest potential use of subprofessionals was difficult. Each of the three fields approached the question from their varying experience with subprofessionals. The health group, representing organizations employing large numbers of subprofessionals, focused primarily on the existing models, especially on the hierarchy in hospital patient-care services. It was generally agreed that professionals, especially the nurses, are an underutilized group, notwithstanding the large number of aides, and that establishment of upgrading mechanisms within this hierarchy is a necessity. Indeed, there are already some steps being taken in this direction and these the group endorsed, calling for more innovation in pre-service, in-service, and part-time paid training to facilitate movement along already existing tracks.

But this alone did not constitute a full answer. Some saw the need to redefine the jobs within those hierarchies and within all health professions, including the physicians'. One goal was to create some intervening occupational levels that would bridge existing gaps. Specifically suggested was a study comparing management of hospital wards by aides with those managed by registered nurses, in the expectation that the comparison would indicate an intervening level -- an aide capable of some aspects of ward management. Others were attracted by the possibility of creating new tracks in hospital management and in technical services that would offer subprofessional sequences appealing to men.

The major issue was whether to consider the use of subprofessionals solely in terms of existing systems of health-care delivery, or as a major resource for developing new patterns of preventative and comprehensive care to reach all segments of the population. To some, the establishment of noninstitutional community health models was of paramount importance. And as one said: "It is my hope that at least 80 percent of new subprofessional jobs will be in entirely new services." The group consensus appeared to be that, while activities to improve current patterns of employment should continue, stronger efforts should be addressed to creating new models without reference to existing structures. These new models would, in turn, suggest improvements in conventional operation.

The education group was similarly divided on whether to extend the existing group of subprofessionals or formulate an entirely new conception. Because employment of subprofessionals in the schools is recent and varied, the members of the workshop spent much of the time comparing experiences. The jobs of school aides or teacher aides, they agreed, are unstandardized, even in one community, and likely to continue without consistent patterns. This was not seen as necessarily bad because, it was felt, states should avoid regulation of subprofessionals, at least for the near future. The majority of subprofessional jobs depends on special sources of funding, they noted, and to some this was the reason why subprofessionals had not as yet attained a precise role integral to school functions.

The apparent fundamental problem in the education discussion was whether subprofessionals can play a part in the instructional process. Representatives of teachers, while supporting the use of aides to alleviate the teacher's workload, considered it premature to attempt to delineate the subprofessional role until the teaching function itself was fully defined and accepted. There appeared to be some flexibility in their position, provided teachers are made a party to the decisions concerning subprofessionals, and guarantees are given that subprofessionals will not be used to increase class size or jeopardize teachers' salaries.

It was clearly recognized, however, by some in the educational workshops, that to superimpose the use of subprofessionals on the existing school structure restricts and extremely limits their role. A small subcommittee was able to agree that auxiliary personnel be used in all areas of education, including instruction. Beyond this general endorsement, in which not all concurred, no specific roles were defined in concrete terms, nor were career patterns suggested other than the normal certification process.

The welfare group, in search of models, pursued a different path. Employment of subprofessionals, in the sense of the conference's use of that title, was limited, and few had any experience with subprofessionals in the casework process. For those who did, the problems of developing a career for case aides were analagous to those of the nurses' aide and teachers' aide. It was impossible, they felt, to promote the aide to the next or professional level on the basis of satisfactory performance as an aide without opening to question the whole educational foundation of the professional structure. But the major interest of this group was not with the services subprofessionals now perform, nor with the casework process in the strict sense, but rather with those services they should or would like to offer. They were able to enumerate a considerable number of work areas suitable for subprofessionals, so numerous that, as some suggested, a possibly more appropriate question might be, "What is it that a professional can do?"

The problem, as they saw it, was how to command the support needed to permit welfare agencies to expand their activities into positive and comprehensive social services. Notwithstanding the range of functions deemed appropriate, they were unable during the conference to integrate the diverse tasks into career patterns. The impression gained was that because the emphasis of welfare is shifting from eligibility determination to broader social services, there is more latitude for experiment than, for instance, in health, whose focus is on improving existing services.

In formulating models, all three fields had some underlying problems. A method for differentiating professional from subprofessional tasks was one. At present the only boundaries are those linked to education. Such boundaries very often do not hold up in practice as roles become blurred, and are difficult to project into wholly new services. In each group, principles of differentiation were discussed, such as separating the performance of the task from the responsibility for accomplishing it. But such theoretical formulations were only of limited value. The possibility that expert job analysis might help to determine the valid distinctions between work levels was considered. However, in each field it was recognized that job analysis can serve a useful purpose only when the total service goals have been established and when all concerned agree on the goals and on the validity of subprofessional careers as a means of attaining them.

Conceptualizing models was inhibited also by the tendency to think of subprofessionals almost exclusively in a helper role. This approach has already attained the stature of a classic model, accepted most readily, because using aides as helpers requires the minimum rearrangement of the traditional organization of work, and allows individual professionals maximum latitude in delegating tasks. The advantages are clear, because such arrangements do not arouse antagonisms on the part of existing staff. But the deficiencies in such arrangements were apparent to the conferees.

When helpers are assigned on a one-to-one basis, little precise job definition is required. When several aides are assigned to one professional, more standardization may occur, but judging by experience in the health field, this may extend no further than any one institution. Aides trained by one hospital are not necessarily qualified for employment in another. The rationale for assigning aides to professionals has been that it follows the traditional apprenticeship pattern and permits the new worker to be trained exclusively on the job. The fallacy is that apprentices in skilled trades or in the earlier days of professional preparation were headed toward becoming journeymen or professionals. Their helper status was clearly a training station, and not a permanent work level. If the subprofessional helper is not to become a professional exclusively on the basis of his apprenticeship, and if his job is not standardized sufficiently to allow for some lateral mobility, then he is frozen at the helper level.

The defects in the apprentice relationship are clearly evident in the health field. Nurses today argue for the baccalaureate requirement because they say that nursing cannot be learned entirely on the job. It is an anachronism, they say, to insist upon apprenticeship when all medical occupations are moving towards increasing dependence on formal training for specialized skills. The health group at the conference did recognize that the aide in a hospital was an anomaly, a generalist in a specialized world. In contrast, those representing school systems argued strongly for the continuation of apprenticeship, with the ultimate delineation of the aides' work roles at the discretion of individual teachers. Admittedly, they based this viewpoint on a desire to prevent standardization from rigidifying present undeveloped patterns. Nonetheless, it is the helper principle that is the primary mode in existing subprofessional assignments.

Alternatives to this model -- defining discrete subprofessional work levels, career tracks leading to new specialties, the development of teams -- were offered, but all are more difficult to implement, and all require cutting across traditional occupational lines, many of which are formalized by law or tradition. Some innovations would require physical as well as operational rearrangements.

The health group was better able to discuss the creation of new specialties or new arrangements than were the representatives of such largely undifferentiated services as education and welfare. Occupations in health are continually in the process of evolving, and the constant role-blurring is indicative of shifting patterns of responsibility. Although some suggested that teaching as a profession is susceptible of specialization, teacher organizations tend to believe that teaching is a one-level occupation and that teachers will resist any attempt at what they consider fragmentation. Moreover, some superintendents, who see team-teaching as a significant approach, noted that even a school's physical facilities are not set up to accommodate teams. Social work as a profession has defined some areas of specialization, but is groping for multi-track approaches to casework services. Public welfare is moving toward segregating eligibility determinations from other aspects of service, but as yet no distinct patterns have emerged.

Without minimizing the difficulties of developing new relationships between subprofessionals and professionals, it was apparent that the helper principle is an impediment because it restricts the subprofessional to one track. Career patterns could be constructed by creating intervening levels and gradations in this one sequence, but the limitations inhibit mobility and tend to confine all human service delivery to the already existing professional modes of operation.

Although no models of full subprofessional use were developed by any of the three groups that satisfied everybody, the participants were increasingly aware of the need for a more creative approach to the use of service manpower. Each group, perhaps conscious of the constraints upon such innovations, found it difficult to discuss subprofessional career possibilities in purely theoretical terms. In fact, some thought abstract discussion meaningless. As the sessions progressed, however, even the most practical-minded saw some utility in sheer speculation. They recognized the necessity for critical appraisal and clarification of manpower goals. Well formulated models, even if difficult to implement, are useful as ideals against which the actuality can be measured.

THE OBSTACLES TO SUBPROFESSIONAL CAREERS

Although it was difficult for the representatives of the three service fields to delineate precise models for subprofessional careers, the obstacles to implementing such models were readily identified. This apparent contradiction was not really illogical. The discussants were well aware of how difficult it is to change manpower structure in the human services. It was possible for them to differentiate probable reactions to proposals for change of any kind from resistance to specific changes in particular tasks. Thus, it was possible for them to consider profitably these obstacles without necessarily having systematized all the changes required by a career model.

Analyzing the Obstacles

The obstacles discussed ranged from broad ideological considerations to specific personnel practices that stand in the way of even such modest changes as providing connecting links between existing jobs. The extensive negotiation needed to allow selected nurses' aides to train as practical nurses while on the job is a case in point. Such problems multiply and intensify when the goal is designing new occupational structures.

The conference saw that in addition to identifying an obstacle, as, for example, the resistance to change on the part of vested-interest groups, it had to determine why there is such resistance. Are there real differences of viewpoint that need resolution, or is resistance mainly a problem of attitudes generated by imperfect communication?

All three fields identified similar problems, invariably noting the constraints of budget limitations, civil service, or other personnel systems, and the resistance of the allied professions or those currently employed in what are accepted as professional jobs. The three fields differed, however, in their emphasis and in their analysis of the principal underlying causes of obstacles. The health group focused on economic issues, the education group on conceptual problems, and the welfare group on the controls imposed by Federal authorities.

In health, it was the poor image of subprofessional occupations that was the primary concern. Contributing to this image, the panelists believed, are the low wages, the terminal nature of most jobs, and the unimportant functions performed by other than professionals in a highly professionalized setting. Underlying these characteristics were the guild system that sets up rigid protective devices and a confused managerial pattern without clear lines of responsibility or authority. What those in health appeared to be saying was that the poor image which repels people with career aspirations is not a distortion but an accurate reflection of the current status of subprofessionals in health. Thus, the image is symptomatic of a system that ascribes little value to subprofessionals. A significant number agreed that if there were genuine concern with the quality of health care and sincere belief that all people should receive decent medical services, "we would create the jobs to do it."

The real obstacle, therefore, was identified as insufficient commitment to broad social goals and to the subprofessional potential for fulfilling the goals. National concern for health care is rising and expressed in increasing sums of money, but public opinion is molded largely by the health professions. As a result, the money is being made available along established lines. Because of the professional viewpoint, traditional modes of delivery remain largely untouched, and perhaps even reinforced by the support given. New systems developed under OEO, for example, such as neighborhood health centers, are generally separate entities with few connections to established modes of medical practice.

The health group appeared to agree that available financial resources are not as much at issue as their allocation. The problem is a lack of substantial resources to modify existing structures and augment them with new forms. For example, subsidized training is directed towards existing jobs, with only negligible amounts available for upgrading those employed. The availability of new forms depends on the conviction that training and quality of professionals is not the whole answer, but that sizeable expenditures of funds and efforts to develop all categories of staff are of substantial, if not equal, value. Only then will the health professions be willing to make the needed revisions in existing hierarchies.

Two significant conclusions emerged from the discussion: first, that poorly paid, deadend jobs are not inherent in the nature of health occupations and that subprofessional careers could be created; second, that the focus must be broadened from an exclusive concern with increasing the supplying mechanisms for existing job categories. Increasing training for existing jobs, although necessary, will not alone suffice. More efforts are needed to develop and expand the scope of jobs for subprofessionals.

The development of careers for subprofessionals in education founders on the problem of the ultimate scope of subprofessional functions. Thus, this group dealt almost exclusively with resistance to redesign of the teaching role, a necessary concomitant to the expansion of subprofessional functions. Its proponents maintain that this resistance is voiced out of a concern for the quality of services. However, it appears to stem also from the practical considerations of teachers' salaries and workloads.

In practice, although some teachers may have considered the aide an imposition, an intrusion, or an extra burden, teachers generally, when aides were made available, accepted them with enthusiasm. In individual cases teachers have allowed aides considerable latitude in function. But the function of aides has been under their control, and what is done in an individual classroom does not affect formal, stated work-standards. Many organizations, which have informally permitted workers to function "out-of-title," would nevertheless resist any explicit recognition of role expansion. The obvious example in the context of this conference is the nurses' aide, who performs professional nursing functions as an emergency measure.

In teaching, as in other fields, the stance of the organization tends to be more rigid than that of the individuals within it. Thus, while individual teachers may encourage individual aides to take on instructional functions, their organizational concern is whether such a move will ultimately result in the use of aides as cheaper substitutes for teachers. If this happened, then the teachers' concern for quality of education would have genuine merit. It seems more likely that the resistance of teacher organizations emanates from a fear that an extended use of aides will mitigate the teacher shortage, thereby weakening their bargaining power for higher wages, or that aides will be used to increase or, in any event, not reduce class size.

The current division over the instructional use of subprofessional teachers appears to arise in part from a confusion of goals. School systems have employed aides as expedients to fill clerical, custodial, and food-service needs. They have employed them in response to the anti-poverty goal of heightening parent involvement with the school by employing neighborhood mothers. Some aides are college students hired as possible professional recruits. Teacher organizations have endorsed a limited use of subprofessionals to free teachers from some of their more burdensome chores or to allow them a break in the day's schedule. The contribution of subprofessionals to the total educational output has seldom been a part of their planned use and there are few examples of any concept of subprofessional jobs as permanent career offerings.

It is against this backdrop of unclear and inconsistent objectives that the increasingly insistent question of teachers' wages must be viewed. Teacher organizations naturally focus on the teacher and, thus, they assess the subprofessional question in terms of the effect on the teacher. Therefore, while teacher groups favor the use of aides to relieve teachers and to make teaching a more manageable job, and accept their employment when the aides' wages are paid out of specially earmarked Federal funds, they resist the use of subprofessionals when such use might need to be supported by a slice of the limited pie -- the total regular school budgets. The limits of these budgets are already strained in the effort to obtain increased teaching salaries. Teachers see subprofessional wages as a possible alternate use of funds, diverting from the limited sums available money that might be applied to teachers' salaries.

Such economic issues are complicated because the impact of subprofessional employment on educational output has not been determined. As many participants noted, there is opinion in favor of the use of subprofessionals but no real knowledge about the returns to education of this or alternate investments. Those who are convinced that a larger educational return can be purchased for a given number of dollars by the use of aides in the instructional process also believe that employment of aides will not inevitably diminish the rate of teacher compensation. Some even suggest that the use of aides to their full potential might ultimately help to raise the teachers' salaries as a consequence of more efficient use of personnel and compensation for the greater demands on teachers for supervision of subprofessional staff. Lacking, however, is any conclusive research evidence supporting all or part of this formulation.

Similarly, the questions of class size, effective classroom management, and appropriate teacher preparation are subjects of considerable theorizing without much in the way of proof. In the absence of such basic knowledge, educators are unable to rationalize a structure incorporating the use of subprofessionals that makes sense to teachers, administrators, or taxpayers. Furthermore, resistance by all categories of educational personnel to evaluation of educational output inhibits the development of the needed knowledge. In the final analysis, the real problem may be an insufficient interest in acquiring the knowledge, or in testing what is already intuitively or empirically believed about the potential of subprofessionals. For it was agreed that most educators do not consider their staffing problems urgent.

For the welfare group, the issues of professional resistance were analagous to those in education, a resistance to the implied threat subprofessionals pose to the status, wages, and work loads of caseworkers. But, because the caseworker's status in welfare relies on general, rather than special educational preparation, and because professional resistance is largely confined to the casework process, the welfare group considered this resistance a less formidable obstacle. They perceived the subprofessional as an instrument for changing and expanding services in new directions -- group work, community organization, housing, employment, and a host of practical services not now provided -- rather than as manpower to function in the established casework services.

The primary constraints for them were the legislative and administrative rules, Federal, state, and local, that dictate personnel policies and allocation of funds. But underlying these restrictions are obvious uncertainties about whether such innovations as the use of subprofessionals conflict with conventional qualitative standards. The bachelor's requirement and caseload minimums set by Federal authorities are an effort to upgrade the quality of service by upgrading the quality of staff. Whether these are realistic standards that can be met and, if met, will improve the output of welfare agencies is a matter of debate.

One recognized problem was that of formulating a personnel policy sufficiently standardized to be acceptable for public employment and yet not dependent on years of school. Another was to develop a method of measuring output without resorting to counting cases. The links between public welfare and the social-work profession, while more ideological than actual because so few graduate social workers are employed in public welfare agencies, is nevertheless a restricting element. The social-work profession sees education as the sole measure of professional capacity, as do legislators, administrators, and the workers themselves. Thus, the viewpoint influences hiring and promotional standards.

Above all, welfare administrators need financial support for experimental and creative approaches to both manpower and service procedures. They, like their counterparts in health and education, may need additional sums, but see possibilities even within current appropriation levels. Welfare agencies, however, face the special problem of primary dependence on Federal support, a support that is available only through compliance with complex and stringent regulations. Many of these regulations, although conceived as stimuli for good practice, serve rather as deterrents to innovation, especially to the full use of subprofessionals. The Federal tendency to reimburse at a higher rate those services performed by professionals was the primary regulation cited. This regulation was considered to be only a manifestation of the "poor law" attitude, for other Federally supported agencies are given far greater latitude. Welfare alone, of the three major service fields, serves only the poor. Not only does it, therefore, have a limited and weaker constituency, but welfare agencies themselves, not unlike their clients, are called to strict accountability for every dollar received.

In summary, the health field, although it enjoys urgent national concern with its problems and has substantial funding, still has major internal problems that impede effective service. These problems arise from a highly complex structure in which professional concerns, although they compete and conflict, still remain paramount. The result is a restraint on manpower innovations, even for other types of staff. Welfare administrators, themselves critical of their service, are handicapped by a public that denigrates the service but is reluctant to provide the means for a better one. Both health and welfare leaders readily saw important and expanded roles for subprofessionals. Their primary need is to develop strategies for action. The schools, however, are caught in the vise of mounting pressures from organized education personnel and community groups, both relatively recent phenomena. As a result, they are unable to move on establishing a relationship between their educational objectives and the concept of subprofessionals. Without resolving this issue, significant progress in developing subprofessional careers cannot be made.

Overcoming the Obstacles

The obstacles to developing a significant subprofessional career were clearly not susceptible of facile or immediate total solution, but neither did they appear to be completely insuperable. For it was equally evident that no matter how stubborn, they were man-made. By contrast, in prior investigations conducted by NCEY the same obstacles were often discussed by individual administrators or officers of policy-making groups as immutable and impersonal laws. The group discussion and ventilation of views across the board permitted by the composition of the conference suggests strongly that inter- and intra-disciplinary communication is essential to an understanding of obstacles and contemplation of solutions.

As a specific example, when the welfare group unanimously registered the opinion that current Federal-state reimbursement policies deter the use of subprofessionals, the Federal representatives were quick to react and note that such rules can be changed. Not all remedies are as easy to diagnose or to prescribe for. As earlier discussions indicated, the specific contemporary problems -- in this case, a regulation -- are frequently not the whole of the problem, but merely a manifestation of fundamental barriers. Nor was the discussion directed to specific practices. On an interdisciplinary basis, the three fields together concentrated on the broad, generic obstacles that resist innovation in the use of subprofessionals and on the fundamental, rather than specific, strategies to be adopted.

Where is policy made and who has the responsibility for initiating change? An answer to this question was considered a prerequisite to the determination of tactics available to prime movers. Although the role of all groups and professions, unions, and governmental bodies was considered important, it was management that was identified as potentially the most effective. Certainly this was seen as true not only for those internal policies within management's control, but also for eliciting the attention of the public, the legislatures, and the regulatory bodies. It is service management's responsibility as employer and as public servant to determine first the service needs and then the manpower needs required to fulfill them. It is obvious, therefore, that the ability of administrators to promote their viewpoint is crucial.

From a tactical standpoint, it was recommended that all vested interests be involved to the maximum in the early stages of any planning of new job designs. Where possible, unions and other employee groups should be assigned part of the responsibility for job design. Although commitment must come from the top, it was also recommended that within large urban or state systems the directors of individual agencies be allowed sufficient freedom to experiment and demonstrate new approaches.

The role of the administrator, then, is to provide the basic drive, but to avoid unilateral imposition by decree. Involvement of all interested groups permits the managers to "sell" the introduction of new jobs or creation of new upgrading mechanisms as a multi-gain. An additional responsibility on the part of management is to assure that the recommended actions meet established goals. This, in principle, suggests that when a school system, for example, delegates the design of aides' jobs to the individual teachers without establishing and maintaining qualitative control, management has abdicated some of its responsibilities.

Convincing legislatures or, in effect, the public, also to some extent devolves upon the administrators. Much here depends on their persuasiveness. But "selling" subprofessionals on the grounds that they are cheaper was, in the majority view, an error. First, it is dishonest, because subprofessionals, if used to enrich and augment services, may add to total costs; and second, public acceptance must be gained for subprofessional productivity as a positive value. Cost considerations can be more objectively and honestly presented in terms of the saving of alternate expenditures. An example is the saving when subprofessionals provide services to the elderly or infirm in their homes, thus eliminating the need for institutionalization.

This much, in general terms, was readily agreed upon, but seasoned administrators in large municipal systems, while acknowledging that skillful management can produce change, and recognizing that considerable responsibility for innovation was theirs, were acutely conscious of their limitations. Despite commitment to the subprofessional career concept, many have been frustrated in their efforts to marshal support from the range of vested interests. Those who lack such commitment are affected by the opposition they foresee.

The conference discussion of possible models for subprofessional use was undoubtedly hindered by the difficulties of thinking about a job design without reference to constraints to which the administrators have become accustomed. The urgency of the quest for sophisticated manpower models and the knowledge to devise them is, no doubt, tempered by the problems of implementation. Thus, while the general opinion was that administrators could and should do more, they also were skeptical of their ability to do more than maneuver within the existing structure, "get something in motion" without confronting the more formidable obstacles, in the hope that resistance will gradually be dissipated. Morris Hursh, Commissioner of Public Welfare of Minnesota, stated the problem in whimsical terms:

> If vou have a smart administrator who can use a little ingenuity and isn't afraid to experiment, who happens to have a very good civil service department, a cooperative union, a reasonable professional organization, a good salary schedule for all classes, career opportunities for subprofessionals, movement laterally and upward -- then you're well on your way toward creating a viable subprofessional role!

In the real world, in which administrators have learned to live, operating within the structures they inherit and effecting compromises between conflicting pressure groups, there has been a tendency to rely on tacit compliance with the rules, or circumvention, as the modus operandi. Budgeted positions remain unfilled because there are no applicants with stipulated qualifications, or, instead, those without requisite credentials are hired under exempt, inappropriate, or provisional titles. Subprofessionals are employed to perform limited functions and then, as an emergency measure, perform others for which they are not trained. These temporary evasions become an entrenched part of the structure, adding to the legacy of future administrators, and nothing is done to change the rules so that they can be adhered to. Moreover, the status of employees of public institutions is injured by inaccurate, provisional, or exempt classifications. Without tenure, a place on the occupational ladder, or any other of the perquisites of stability that compensate for inadequate pay, public service jobs diminish in attraction.

There were many participants who saw an ad hoc approach as eminently practical, rather than a quixotic attempt to tackle fundamental problems. Nevertheless, they recognized that, without a planned and integrated approach, the possibility of substantial accomplishment in developing the use of subprofessionals would be impaired.But for the full-fledged, planned campaigns, more than commitment or consummate skills of persuasion on the part of administrators is needed. The obstacles are well established and well defended, and administrators do not have sufficient leverage.

Civil service and other centrally structured merit systems have been considered by many administrators a chief bar to manpower innovation. In the workshop discussions, those who represented civil service and merit systems presented their view that such systems were designed in response to identified personnel needs and are capable of constant revision. It was noted that the identification of needs and recommendations for new or modified classifications should be initiated by the employers. Admittedly, the flexibility of such systems was limited, in principle, by the need to meet legislative requirements and to reconcile individual job and wage changes to the total scheme. Moreover, the degree of flexibility depends on the attitude of the particular civil service or merit system personnel.

During the workshops, some administrators commented that perhaps they had overstated the rigidities of civil-service classification systems. However, it must be noted that the civil service and merit system representatives at the conference were invited because they were both receptive to the subprofessional concept and leaders in revising traditional standards. The question remains whether systems devised to protect public employment from patronage in an era when applicants outnumbered jobs can also serve to attract and develop personnel when the available labor supply appears to be so out of tune with existing classification schemes. That so many classified and budgeted positions remain unfilled despite mounting personnel shortages suggests that perhaps major modifications, beyond revision of precise categories, are needed. The entire conception of structured public personnel systems may be inimical to an experimental use of new sources of labor.

It has been asserted that the primary need in developing subprofessional careers is an open hiring policy and a flexible experimental approach. If this is so, the fundamental tenets of public employment systems may be inappropriate. The requirement in public employment to spell out in advance specific uniform job descriptions complete with objective requirements, and selection procedures cannot be met when there is not as yet precise knowledge of subprofessional tasks, the skills required for their performance, or valid criteria for determining the existence of these skills. The emphasis on selection, dictated by the public-employment view that advance screening is imperative because once a worker is "in" he has rights of tenure or promotion, runs counter to an open-hiring policy. Also, formal posting of jobs and bureaucratic procedures with their attendant delays inhibit recruitment of those who might most desire and benefit from subprofessional employment.

Moreover, civil service, like unions or professional associations, becomes the protector of those who are already in the system. The ability of public employees to negotiate higher wages is promoted by increasing the entry requirements for their jobs which, in practice, means higher education credentials. The conference participants representing professional schools, professional associations, and unions were conscious of the problem created by maintaining inflexibly that only academic education can prepare a person for responsible work in the human services, but they were unable to accept that for any existing profession the credential requirements are too high. In fact, some felt that increasing the use of subprofessionals and expanding their role would require raising the requirements for professionals.

They focused, instead, on the procedures by which credentials are obtained, emphasizing the need to make licenses, certificates, and academic degrees more accessible by subsidizing tuition, work-study, or earn-while-you-learn arrangements. They were able only to agree that at the entry level subprofessional jobs could be freed from requirements other than those dictated by the entry-level tasks, or by considerations of public safety. They were unable to extend this to advancement or careers. As an exercise in pure theory they could accept the idea of subprofessional advancement on the basis of performance rather than academic credits, but they could not see how in practice human-service tasks could be divorced from academic education.

A basic problem is the traditional posture of professionalism, which asserts that it is a profession's prerogative to decide how and by whom its professional functions are to be performed. Nursing, teaching, and social work are endeavoring to strengthen their ability to assert this prerogative. They see a need to emulate the medical and legal professions' ability to determine who can enter their ranks. They believe they must have, as one participant said, a "compelling if not controlling voice" in all pertinent decisions. Without disputing this, in principle, some suggested that unless the professionals accept the likelihood that subprofessionals will increase and become leaders in the development of subprofessional roles, they run the risk that others will make the essential decisions. There were some, indeed, who indicated a preference that such decisions be made in the political arena rather than by the professional groups, and others detected encroachment in the decisions by industry. But these trends were generally deplored.

Professional influence will undoubtedly continue to be felt and professional interests should be considered. Whether their voice is to be the sole determinant is open to question. But it is clear that the professions could be an important constructive force in improving human services and in employing subprofessionals. Perhaps their resistance to change has been regarded as somewhat more inflexible than it is in actuality. The professional concern that the use of subprofessionals will undermine professional standards has been voiced simultaneously with considerable self-criticism, directed particularly at current modes of professional preparation. This is especially true in the field of education.

It may be conjectured that the denigration of professional service as middle-class and ineffectual with slum populations, a common basis for advocating the use of subprofessionals in the early days of the war on poverty, resulted in a build-up of professional resistance. As the romanticism of the past few years has been tempered by experience to a more moderate view of subprofessional capacity, no longer claiming that poverty or ethnic background is of itself superior to any training or education, the professional view appears to have softened. All participants found much of value in anti-poverty programs and sought their continuance and expansion. As further evidence of increasing receptivity to the subprofessional concept, the address by Charles Cogen, president of the American Federation of Teachers, to the union's 1967 convention is noteworthy. Although he asserted that "I am not talking about aides as permanent full-time substitutes for teachers," he went on to say: "There is a real danger that this may be attempted, and we must be on guard. If our school systems are to adopt the concept of increased use of paraprofessionals, however, it is essential that career lines be established, perhaps leading to full teacher status, if this can be done without sacrificing academic standards."

Mr. Cogen's statement identifies the crux of the problem, the lack of standards for determining subprofessional competence other than the conventional certification process. A major tactic to secure professional acceptance of subprofessional potential is research and demonstrations that test the validity of employment based on other than traditional educational requirements. This is true in all fields.

The workshop group considering the problem of wages and job mobility confronted the same problem -- the lack of work standards. The twin, interdependent evils of subprofessional jobs as they exist today, low wages and immobility, both derive in part from the inability to determine quantitative or qualitative measures of performance. In the absence of performance standards, both pay rates and position on occupational ladders depend on such arbitrary measures as years in schools or length of service. This becomes a reductio ad absurdum when, as has occurred in some unskilled, manual-labor civil-service jobs, those with an eighth-grade education are paid at a slightly higher rate than those who have only seven years of schooling. Obviously, with purely physical tasks, some measures of performance could be devised. In work connected with human service, the professional resistance to evaluation and the difficulties of devising measures for non-physical or non-technical work pervade the entire system, and all employees are evaluated on the basis of some form of credential.

It was recognized that, in the absence of work standards, the general problem of substandard wage levels for most human-service personnel is compounded by the inability to discriminate levels of productivity. Union leaders and others who seek to increase wages of subprofessionals were unable to suggest criteria other than a living wage with increments for length of service. In effect, this is a replica of professional wage policies, which seldom provide recognition for superior individual performance. Wage policies based on output and merit and promotional patterns that accredit individual competence could not be devised by the workshop group, although they were aware that without some measure of productivity bargaining for wages becomes a power struggle.

The development of relevant work standards was seen, however, as essential for efficient management and crucial for assuring the worker some employment mobility. For without attested performance levels, a worker's experience and skills are not transferable to other employers, locales, or occupations, or susceptible of accreditation toward any form of credential. The group displayed considerable ambivalence, however, toward standardizing subprofessional jobs. On the one hand, it was virtually the consensus that to institutionalize subprofessional roles and to endow them with an accepted status would require widespread acceptance of realistic descriptions of tasks and qualifications. But in the face of how little is known about necessary skill levels and about techniques for measuring service skills, many participants were wary of attempts to regularize subprofessional employment, at least for the present. They feared "premature ossification of new jobs, before there is sufficient knowledge of what works and what does not." Some were opposed in principle because of their negative experience with the prevailing credential rigidities, and because they believed evaluation of human-service output to be virtually impossible.

There were some who believed that appropriate standards could be devised, that there is already a body of knowledge concerning individual differences and their detection, and that it is possible to establish performance standards and requisite skills without necessarily evaluating the total impact of an institution's services. They saw two urgent necessities -- first, opportunities for experiments to test what is already known or believed and, second, new labor-management approaches.

With respect to the first need, the opportunity for experiment, to date the prime source has been Federal programs. These programs have been a valuable stimulus to the acceptance of the subprofessional concept, but their effect on the development of permanent subprofessional careers has been impaired by the uncertain duration of programs, the lack of facilities for planning and evaluation, and the limited direct involvement with conventional service institutions. Many recommendations were made for strengthening and expanding the scope of Federal activity by building into programs a longer-range commitment and research facilities. Another suggestion was that programs such as the Neighborhood Youth Corps and the Job Corps, and special training and educational support activities, be directed specifically towards the needs of subprofessionals. This was urged particularly for Federal programs in the areas of vocational and allied professional education. The primary issue, however, as seen by the participants, was that Federal activities, although the mainspring of innovation, have been deflected from the established employers' needs because of resistance at the local level. The Scheuer Amendment is a step towards connecting Federal programs with permanent public service occupations, but it is a relatively small program and oriented primarily towards anti-poverty considerations.

Thus, the discussants felt, in addition to the need for continued pressure on Congress, is the need for mechanisms to transfer to regular service employment what Federal programs have learned, and to combat the resistance that is manifest especially at state and local levels. Fiscal controls for most public-service organizations are imposed by state and local authorities, who determine not only the precise budgetary allocations, but the licensing and certification requirements as well. At these levels of government, not only do policies vary widely from one community to another but, in general, there has not been any appreciable interest in subprofessionals. Concerted action in state and local political arenas will be required to raise the level of understanding and receptivity to the subprofessional manpower concept and to secure appropriate changes in policy and regulations. Without such action, there is little hope that developments under Federal funding will survive should the support terminate, or that steps will be taken to move subprofessionals beyond crash programs for the poor.

Although the conference view was that administrators hold the key to arousing local interest, the range of obstacles and the degree of resistance they must overcome suggested that they will need support. To conceive of the individual administrator, or even top management groups, as having complete influence over all internal policies, let alone the external rules, was obviously an oversimplification. In large government systems, as in large modern corporations, both the resistances to change and the locus of decision-making reside deep within the organization. In industry, as John Kenneth Galbraith suggests, the basis for decisions is lodged with technical, planning, and other specialized staff, and much power is in the hands of those who provide the information on which decisions are based. The basic problem for administrators in most human services is that the organizational mechanisms within which they work are geared primarily to the maintenance of established policy. This is largely true of the external controls as well. What most administrators lack are mechanisms directed toward innovation and change, in general, and more specifically those mechanisms for developing new manpower models. One participant suggested that each public department of significant size be staffed with manpower experts charged with the responsibility for planning effective use of personnel. This is one possibility, but, in addition, there is a clear need for time, money, and staff for research and development.

Over and beyond internal mechanisms for instituting change, administrators will need allies, and a first priority is for management-labor alliances to deal with the subprofessional issues away from the adversary context. Relations with associations and unions of professionals have been confined largely to wage and other bargaining issues, and there has been little open discussion of basic manpower strategies and their potential merits. In the course of the conference, representatives of these groups evinced increasing flexibility of attitude as their understanding of the issues enlarged. It was perceived that the development of subprofessionals could be a topic for genuine management-labor consultation without the controversial atmosphere of the bargaining table. Collaboration between interested parties appears to offer the best conditions for designing and testing models that could furnish some convincing data on the merits of employing subprofessionals, and of introducing new methods for compensating all categories of staff for superior performance.

Unions that already represent subprofessionals, especially those of hospital workers, have demonstrated an interest in and a capability for developing the subprofessional role. But their efforts are limited by their attempt to imitate the approach of most professional groups. The potential value of new organizations to represent subprofessionals was only briefly discussed in the conference, with no apparent consensus. It was the view of William H. Robinson, Chicago's director of public welfare, that new labor-management mechanisms are needed. He said, "We look for innovations in subprofessional organizations to develop patterns of cooperation and minimize conflict." Few, however, appeared to share his view. They concentrated on existing mechanisms in their search for strategies for overcoming obstacles.

The need for new mechanisms may extend, beyond the internal structures, to new social mechanisms to implement the broader changes in community attitudes and social policy that some participants deemed essential. The job of "selling" the subprofessional to the public and thus influencing legislators and other political figures may require a new organization free from prior commitments, or, at least, new coalitions of public-service employers, the directly-related interest groups, and a broad spectrum of citizens' groups. The ability of representatives of diverse viewpoints and interests to find in the conference setting mutual goals, discuss strategies, and then propose specific action is evidence that concerted exploration and planning can be an effective stimulus to change. Although the priorities and the specific actions and tactics may vary with the community or the field of work, the overriding strategy is a complex of activities to develop, interpret, and communicate systematically the goals of subprofessional employment and the means of accomplishing them.

THE ISSUES OF SUPPLY

Discussion of the issues in attracting and developing subprofessional personnel was confined largely to broad principles of recruitment, selection, training, and education. In the absence of well-defined subprofessional models, more definitive formulation was virtually impossible. The discussion, even in these broad terms, reconfirmed the importance of developing such models. It was evident that plans for what are essentially supplying mechanisms cannot be formulated with precision unless the job designs toward which they are directed are clearly understood. Ideally, the design of jobs and a hiring and promotion policy, as well as those mechanisms that support them, should be planned concurrently. There is a mutual interaction between them. The choice in recruiting obviously depends on the jobs to be performed, and job design needs to be related to the anticipated labor supply. But if a choice has to be made, and if subprofessionals are to become a major manpower instrument, a job design at least in basic outline should come first. It should be drafted in response to the desired service output, subject to modifications dictated by the availability of people and of training or education for them.

This order of priority was acutely evident in the discussion of recruiting. All who took part in it would have liked to see more men employed in the human services. However, the current use of subprofessionals, their functions, their role as helpers to predominantly female professionals, and a wage scale insufficient for heads of families made it evident that this wish will be difficult to transform into reality. Simply luring men into these occupations was obviously not the answer. They cannot and perhaps should not be induced to become aides unless they can at least earn an adequate wage.

If the subprofessional is to become more than an anti-poverty measure, the extent to which recruiting efforts concentrate on the poor must also be questioned. To some, this question seemed academic, since it is only the poor who now work as subprofessionals or are likely to be available for subprofessional jobs as they now exist. But to those who could envision better-paying jobs with substantial advancement opportunities, the question was valid, if only theoretical. The general view was that the focus should not be exclusively on the poor, nor should they be given explicit preference in hiring, except for the particular jobs where residence in a slum area or aspects of their life experience might be a qualifier. The priority for the poor should be in recruiting, with guarantees that all avenues be utilized to make those in poverty groups aware of new career opportunities. This was not seen as a priority in hiring, but as a part of the intent of subprofessional job creation. To support such a priority, recruiting activities must be developed to counter the impression that only the highly educated are eligible for careers in the human services.

It was urged that young people must be reached as well as adults. For youth, the schools are the obvious source of recruits. Effective recruitment will require not only better counseling, but also the introduction into curriculum of orientation to service careers, and the establishment of connections between such curriculum and after-school or part-time jobs. There is no reason, however, why such curriculum or work-study arrangements need be limited to schools serving primarily the disadvantaged.

One resource now generally unutilized, noted especially by the union representatives in the group, is those workers already employed in the services both in subprofessional or other unskilled jobs. The union view was that these workers should have a first priority for upgrading to new levels. Administrators and others readily agreed that to think exclusively in terms of bringing new people in for subprofessional jobs was, in a sense, perpetuating the discontinuity of most service employment.

Methods for accomplishing so all-embracing a recruiting approach were only partially discussed. A few noted the limitations of techniques traditional in public employment -- posting and advertising in mass media -- and they recognized that this would have to be augumented by aggressive outreach. In fact, one of the suggested uses of subprofessionals themselves was to develop two-way communication between employers and all groups that contain potential applicants.

Focus on recruitment techniques has as yet not been extensive because there has been an adequate supply of applicants for subprofessional jobs as they now exist, at least in terms of numbers. Some school personnel, however, noted that the current overabundance of applicants may not continue if subprofessional employment takes on projected dimensions. In fact, if the ready supply is once exhausted and if subprofessionals will then need to be recruited with some measure of the intensity now devoted to recruiting professionals, then, and only then, will more imaginative recruiting methods be developed. The pressure of economic forces also will then begin to affect wage and promotional policies.

In what way should recruiting subprofessionals and professionals be related? It was recognized early that confining the search to those with professional potential would be a mistake, but so would recruiting for each entry job separately with no thought to career connections. If the subprofessionals are to have career potentials up to and even beyond current professional levels, although not necessarily for all, then their initial selection is crucial. The problem of selecting candidates for their potential development is fraught with difficulties. First, there are no reliable predictive measures. The tendency is to predict future performance on the basis of past history and accomplishments, especially in education. Tests of aptitude and personality factors are, by themselves, unreliable. Notwithstanding, when employers focus on the capability for higher levels of work than the job at hand, the common practice has been to hire the substantially overqualified, in terms of education or experience. Private industry follows this practice and often will hire only high-school graduates for any and all work, and employs college graduates as messengers, clerical workers, foremen, or in other jobs for which their bachelor's degrees may be either unnecessary or irrelevant. The luxury of an overqualified staff is one the large, prestigious companies feel they can afford. Although their turnover rate among such employees is high, they justify their practices as stock-piling talent for future development. Public and non-profit employment often use a similar approach, manifest in the agreement at the conference that professionals are generally underutilized, but justified on the basis of assuring a high quality of services. The emphasis on selection is intensified in civil-service systems, where initial screening is seen as necessary because of tenure.

Some suggested, however, that overstatement of requirements may be as detrimental to the over-all quality of service as understatement, and all agreed that credentials should be re-examined to determine their relevance, both to the demands of work and to the availability of personnel. None were happy with policies whereby established credentials were evaded through the creation of permanent emergencies. But the precise aptitudes, personality factors, skills, or other elements of successful subprofessional work appeared to defy definition. Perhaps those in public service are so inured to employment-by-credential that little thought has been given to developing job requirements in any other terms. As noted earlier, they appeared to feel that for entry levels nothing more than basic literacy was needed. The difficult question was how to hire those with potential for upgrading, if all that is demanded at entry is the capacity to perform entry-level tasks. Selection for upgrading could not, most thought, be based on satisfactory entry-level performance. Here again, the spectre of educational requirements and other credentials may be lurking, obscuring the issues.

Those with substantial experience in demonstration projects suggest that the problem is not that complex. Trying people in various jobs can provide effective measures of their future potential. Not all will be accurate and not all subprofessionals will be competent, but then, they say, not all in any group, even among the most highly professional, are competent. From experimental programs comes the recommendation to de-emphasize selection. Hiring, they propose, should be at random or on a first-come, first-served basis, acknowledging the inability to predict accurately those who will succeed, and training should be the focus. In the training process potential can be more realistically and more accurately appraised. The conference group accepted this formulation in principle, but found it generally inapplicable to public employment. Budgets allow only for designated slots and, under civil service or other uniform personnel systems, some objective criteria and the details of a selection process must be spelled out. The bases for promotion policies are equally stringent. To hire at random and promote on the basis of individual merit is not feasible in most of public employment.

The inability to reconcile the desire to diminish the emphasis on selection with the demands of public employment stems from a tendency to consider selection within the framework of current training and educational facilities. For not only do hiring policies need to be reshaped to allow more opportunity for trial and error -- for action based on the best judgment of employers -- but clearly training and education need to be brought in line with subprofessional development. Both on-the-job training and formal education can serve as screening methods, as they have in professional education and training. The hoped-for difference is that the approach would be to screen in rather than screen out, as it perhaps also should be in professional circles. The professional dropout rate, both during and after training, is sufficiently high to suggest that professional recruitment and selection is, at the least, imperfect. Perhaps similar attrition will be inevitable in subprofessional development programs, in view of the inaccuracy of prediction techniques, and this should be recognized when costs of subprofessional training programs are assessed.

The participants saw value in both on-the-job training and academic education. For some jobs, experience was deemed a more effective trainer; for others, formal education was preferred. But for the whole range of subprofessional employment what is needed is a mix of both, with close coordination between the two components. Formal programs and work experience can be complementary, with experience reinforcing the education curriculum, and curriculum amplified in practice. Through close coordination of work and study from earliest through postgraduate levels, it will be possible to make education more relevant to employment, and the schools more helpful in accrediting experience.

As was to be expected, those in health were able to discuss the merits of training more fully because of their experience in training many levels of staff. It was this group that discussed the possibilities of a core concept for training and education. A common general introductory course to all health occupations or even to all service occupations was suggested. Others detected a need to break down existing course offerings into smaller steps or create narrower specialties to insure success in training for a wider range of persons. There was, however, an awareness of the dangers of increasing job immobility by overspecialization, at least at the lower occupational levels. The precise formulations, they recognized, will require joint study by curriculum experts and employers, and testing in pilot programs.

All participants recognized that if the schools are to serve as a screening and training ground, curricula will need considerable reorientation. For as one said: "Not only have kids not been directed towards public service, but they have actually been steered away from it." General education, and especially vocational education, needs to be directed towards service employment. Vocational education needs a new emphasis on and coordination with work opportunities. But vocational education suffers from a stigma, both in the minds of educators and the public, that needs correcting. Some contended that this is evidence of a cultural lag, that vocational education has changed, and that its new, improved status needs to be publicized. Federal aid in the recent Vocational Education Act has been a stimulus, but more will be needed, especially to prod the state and local systems into maximizing current vocational-education potential, let alone developing more programs. And perhaps vocational education needs not only new focus, but some research evidence to prove its value and counteract old prejudices.

Experience with both vocational education in particular, and with school systems in general, varied with the community. Some administrators have found total training responsibilities to be theirs because "the schools don't have to provide curriculum if they don't want to -- they are a law unto themselves." Others have had complete cooperation. This suggests a need for some efforts to gain a national commitment and standards for collaboration between schools, including the universities, and the service agencies.

The focus on schools, it was agreed, snould not exclude the out-of-school youth. Strong recommendations were made that programs such as the Job Corps, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, and offerings under the Manpower Development and Training Act be geared toward public-service employment. The Scheuer Amendment, if amended to lower the age limit to 16, may be a step in this direction. All programs, however, need to be considered potential training grounds for subprofessionals. It should be noted once again that the lack of jobs has been a hindrance. As mentioned in advance papers and by some participants, training under MDTA and other programs for health workers has not always been fruitful, especially in areas where training stipends exceeded the wages paid in employment.

In addition to the need for developing programs, the group recognized the need for additional tuition reimbursement and subsidized training and education, especially to make it possible for workers to prepare for careers while gainfully employed. Paid training time requires a double expenditure, covering both the training costs and the work time spent in training. The question turned on the responsibility for such support. The general expectation was that free tuition requires public support, but the participants were divided on whether the employer should assume the cost of wages to those whose training falls during work time. The double role of education in manpower development makes this issue more apparent. There were some who urged that the schools assume responsibility for the next step for all students, whether it be college preparation or work training. But this is in the school's capacity as a supplier and developer of personnel. Can the schools also be expected to pay wages to their employees in training in addition to supporting tuition costs?

The question more broadly stated is whether it is an employer's responsibility to develop his employees with the assistance of public education and training facilities. A substantial number answered affirmatively, saying that it is not sheer altruism, but good management. When an employer is committed to internal staff development, his costs of turnover go down and worker productivity rises. Some, especially in health, felt that such a burden would result in insupportable increases in the already excessive costs of service. But, as one said: "We are already paying the costs of not training people," suggesting that training might add to the total institutional cost, but not to unit service costs. He was referring to the costs of high turnover, but there are other costs of not training, less apparent but nonetheless real, in the instability of an insufficiently productive work force and the social costs of unsatisfactory services. Apart from economic issues, some administrators have assumed the training role by default or because, as one welfare administrator said: "We have these people in our hands."

For public employment, or even non-profit organizations that depend heavily on public funds, the specific allocation of financial responsibility appears to be relatively insignificant. The social cost will be roughly the same, regardless of which fiscal entity pays the bill. The determination of how to develop subprofessionals, to what extent in on-the-job programs and what part in formal programs, ideally should be made on the merits of these alternatives, and not on the basis of available funds. But in the face of practicalities, those facilities most readily available may have to be used. The determination of ideal conditions, however, is helpful to prevent expedient compromises from becoming the accepted and formalized practice.

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

> It is always difficult to articulate new roles in a rapidly changing world, but we must not let that deter us. We must move on the needs as we now perceive them and with the knowledge at hand, because only in the process of trying new methods can they be tested.

This comment by one of the participants, as the workshops considered recommendations for action, summed up the discussion. The output of the sessions addressed to the development of models for subprofessional careers had been limited; the analysis of the obstacles to innovation that face employers in the human services had been voluminous. At first, it seemed that it was the lack of balance which discouraged consideration of concrete steps to be taken, but eventually it was recognized that the obstacles are so immediate and loom so large that they tend to inhibit even the discussion of effective demand for or supply of subprofessionals.

As a consequence of this realization, most of the conferees were able to agree that although knowledge about how to create subprofessional jobs and subprofessional workers is far from complete, and although the many conflicts and deterrents are unlikely to be totally resolved, constructive activity can be undertaken. It was the majority view, for instance, based on the accumulated long-range experience with public-service employment at the conference, that resistance to proposed changes at any one time, although seemingly massive, tends to be temporary despite its momentary vehemence. This view was so broadly held that the conferees voiced a cautionary note. The design of any new work roles, they felt, should be carefully planned to include flexibility and the understanding that the jobs are likely to be changed, because it is predictable that as subprofessional jobs become better established and more widely instituted, resistance will arise when the time comes to modernize them.

The concluding plenary session of the conference, which followed the workshop discussion of plans for action, had as its theme the question: "Where do we go from here?" The following presentations by three panelists chosen from among the participants propose a considerable range of action. The views expressed were clearly the result, at least in large part, of insights developed during the course of the conference. Evident within them are many of the concerns that were common to the three service fields as well as the specialized requirements of the individual services.

A BLUEPRINT FOR ACTION

Isadore Tuerk, M.D.
Commissioner, Department of Mental Hygiene
Baltimore, Maryland

I found this conference very stimulating and thought-provoking. The encounter with representatives from Education, Welfare, Health, Merit Systems, Labor, Veterans Administration, Civil Service, Budget, Sociology, and Nursing was refreshing and challenging. I hope the conference directors follow up this session by contacting the participants in the next six months or so to determine what tangible actions have been taken as a consequence of what transpired here. I also hope there will be a more specific effort to involve the American Psychiatric Association, American Psychological Association, National Association of Social Workers, National League for Nursing, and other national professional groups to explore the possibilities of developing subprofessional groups and to prepare position papers on this important matter.

The psychiatric revolution that we have been witnessing in the past 5-10 years, with its emphasis on developing community mental health programs and centers and its demand that state mental hospitals evolve rapidly into active treatment centers of excellence, has created an urgent requirement that we cope with the manpower needs implicit in this development. It has demanded that we reexamine the role of the professional and clarify his function and free him to meet his task more appropriately. It has also brought into sharper focus the invaluable role of the subprofessional and our obligation to organize subprofessional careers that are fulfilling to those who enter such careers and make it possible for gifted subprofessionals who are motivated to pursue and achieve professional status.

We have already taken certain tentative steps in Maryland in the area of mental hygiene toward developing subprofessional personnel and careers and toward trying to clarify and refine the roles of the professionals. For example, in Montgomery County, Dr. Janet Rioch and Dr. Charmian Elkes developed a training program for university women to do psychotherapy. This has been picked up at Sinai Hospital and the Johns Hopkins Hospital in Baltimore City in the development of similar small training programs for college women. But we have not yet developed budgeted positions for such trained women in our state mental hospitals or our public mental health community programs.

We already have in-service training programs for the production of psychiatric aides and practical nurses, and there are career opportunities for them. We have just obtained approval for opening up educational opportunities in community colleges for subprofessionals to receive Associate of Arts degrees as mental health technicians, and are in the process of establishing budgeted positions for them in state mental hospitals, day hospitals, and comprehensive community mental health centers. Our support for such training is in the form of allowing time off to attend such courses while receiving full pay. We have permitted some subprofessionals to attend degree nursing schools while employed in our hospitals, and, in one case, an R.N. to attend the University of Maryland School of Nursing to obtain a master's degree in psychiatric nursing. The stipulation in these examples is that there be an obligation to serve the hospital for two years after obtaining the benefit of the college training.

We are in the process of developing positions of alcoholism counselors for recovered alcoholics,and we want to achieve this at appropriate salaries for these individuals, many of whom are very talented. There are other programs in social work and rehabilitation therapy.

We have asked our hospital superintendents and our program directors to think about and describe the goals and functions of the hospitals and the professional groups, and as a result of this conference I will be clearer in working with the superintendents and program directors in arriving at these difficult descriptions. We have found there has been a great deal of role-blurring in recent years in the categories of nursing, social work, psychology, rehabilitation therapy, psychiatry, etc. There has been a healthy, vigorous experimentation in what each professional group is doing and it is time that we try to clarify where we are, what we are doing, and what further functions can be taken over appropriately by subprofessionals. It will be necessary for us to be explicit not only about the variety of subprofessionals we are seeking to establish but also to permit flexibility for new categories to emerge.

This conference impressed on me specifically the value of giving greater attention to middle management career opportunities. Inherent in all this is the continuing need to improve the public image of the mental hospital, the community mental health programs, the community mental health center program, and the dignity and status of personnel working as professionals and subprofessionals in these areas. Inherent in all this is the continuing need to provide better salaries for all personnel in mental health careers. Inherent in all this is the need to work closely with management and supervisory levels to accord respect, acceptance, and trust to subprofessional personnel, and to involve more effectively subprofessional personnel in decision-making and participation in the total therapeutic program.

Whatever I've described about the mental health field applies equally well to the field of mental retardation. Psychiatrists, pediatricians, psychologists, psychiatric nurses, social workers, and rehabilitation therapists must increasingly learn how to be consultants as well as direct clinicians; must learn how to impart insights and techniques to many personnel in the community who work directly with troubled children, adolescents, adults, and elderly people; must learn how to work effectively as consultants to public school teachers and principals, to ministers, to parole and probation workers, to lawyers, to neighborhood counselors, etc., etc. They must learn to accept these groups as co-professionals.

I propose to follow up this conference by calling a succession of workshops on the role of the professional and the creation of subprofessional careers. I propose to include in these workshops representatives of administration and the various professional and subprofessional groups, representatives from the Governor's Office and the State Legislature, the Unions, the Health Department, Department of Education, Department of Welfare, Office of the Commissioner of Personnel, Budget Department, Office of Employment Security, Anti-Poverty Programs, Universities, Maryland Association for Mental Health, and Maryland Association for Retarded Children, etc. I hope to report to them on this conference and to elicit their thinking and support in the development of subprofessional career opportunities. Out of such workshops,I hope, will emerge on-going tasks forces to follow through for a protracted period.

I also anticipate further dialogue from time to time with Mr. Eli Cohen and his staff for purposes of stimulation and critique.

Finally, our large mental hospitals have residency programs for psychiatrists which are approved by the American Medical Association for the full three years of such training required by the Specialty Board in Psychiatry for examination for certification as a specialist in psychiatry. We are proud of such approval and it receives appropriate publicity. I wonder if some national or state board can be created for the purpose of establishing standards and guidelines for subprofessional career programs, which can inspect and approve such career training programs, and which undoubtedly would serve as an important stimulus and guide for us in Maryland in our venture in this undertaking and result in similar pride and favorable publicity when attained. Such national or state boards could serve as sources of inspiration for other states. Or, to put it another way, the presence or absence of approvable subprofessional career-training and opportunities could affect the decision of accreditation of hospitals by the National Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals, which represents the American College of Physicians, American College of Surgeons, American Hospital Association, and American Medical Association. The Commission is a powerful body which has enormous prestige and could affect very significantly general hospitals as well as state mental hospitals, private psychiatric hospitals, and comprehensive community mental health centers.

A long range goal then would be to influence the Joint Commission on Hospital Accreditation to require such subprofessional career programs in hospitals as a part of accreditation.

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

Carl Dolce
Superintendent of Schools
Orleans Parish
New Orleans, La.

The answer to the question "Where do we go from here?" depends on our assesment of where we in education are now, an analysis of the future developments, and the forces at work in the field. It became increasingly clear to me at this conference that there is little agreement in the field of education about the use of subprofessionals and that, furthermore, there is some resistance to the idea. In addition, the workshop discussions contributed to my awareness of the forces that will either tend to impede or give particular direction to the use of subprofessionals in the schools.

First it must be recognized that teaching as a profession holds an insecure place in our society. Teachers have been, and are, trying desperately to establish the field of teaching as a profession. Teachers do not control entry into the profession, do not police the profession, and do not set the profession's standards. To teachers the use of subprofessionals suggests a possible reduction of social distance and a possible lowering of the status of the teacher.

Second, teaching is still a relatively low-paid occupation. The employment and training of massive numbers of subprofessionals could represent a redirection of resources that might otherwise go toward improving salaries and working conditions for teachers. There is also a concern that the use of subprofessionals may be merely an administrative device to reduce the cost of education.

Third, after decades of struggle to improve standards of education, there is a genuine fear of the possibility of lowering educational standards through the employment of the subprofessional.

Fourth, competition between the teacher organizations that are struggling for power adds to the potential resistance, inasmuch as one organization has already attempted to establish job differentiations within the area of teaching.

Fifth, the lack of a clear definition of the purposes of education further complicates this picture. The purpose of education, as you all know, is in a state of flux and is being broadened, and education is assuming many welfare and community aspects that it has never held previously. Now, naturally, the burden of meeting areas of resistance, areas which would tend to give peculiar twists to the use of the subprofessional, rests with the proponents of the use of subprofessionals in the field of education.

In my judgment, there must be two basic approaches -- one a national approach and the other a local approach -- in attempting to stimulate the use of subprofessionals in education. I think that it is imperative to demonstrate that it is in the self-interest of teachers to promote the use of subprofessionals. The need here, in my judgment, is to develop alternative models to illustrate how the use of subprofessionals will enhance the system of rewards for teachers and improve both the status and professionalism of teachers. In my judgment, this is something that must take place at a national level, because the concern here is with national forces at work.

Next, I believe that it is imperative to set up a dialogue between representatives of the two national teacher organizations, the NEA and the AFT, in an attempt to free the discussion of the subprofessional issue from the current organizational competition. There is already room for the development of the subprofessional role in education, in areas over which there is little conflict among the professionals. These are the areas of noninstructional matters, where the organizational rivalries do not converge. There is greater agreement and less threat. In order to facilitate the development in this area, it seems to me that on the local level there must be a dialogue among administrators and teachers and the existing groups of subprofessionals. In many cities the use of noninstructional aides will naturally become part of the bargaining process.

What I am suggesting is that the conference we are currently attending must be followed by additional and continuous stimulation of the professional field. One method is to make use of the full range of professional journals. For example, the use of the National School Board's journal could make board members sensitive to alternate methods of organizing the staffing of schools, so that they in turn would ask their administrators why they are not doing something, or more, in the use of subprofessionals. Administrators themselves must be stimulated directly through their journals, and the dialogue concerning the subprofessional must permeate all publications circulated among teachers. I do not believe that widespread dissemination of this information will occur haphazardly or by chance, but must be part of a planned and coordinated approach to the problem of stimulating the expanded use of subprofessionals.

There has been much discussion during this conference about the need to define the role of the subprofessional in terms of the role of the professional. I believe that this is correct from the long-range point of view. However, I believe that it would be a strategic error to delay the development of subprofessional roles until the role of the professional is defined. It appears to me that the role of the professional is and should be a developing one. And the problem of role definition is a never-ending one. What I'm suggesting here is a piecemeal approach to the problem of the use of the subprofessional in education, by which certain aspects of the teaching function must be analyzed without attempting to analyze the entire teaching function.

I would recommend that a group representing all relevant segments of education be well-funded and charged with the problem of defining the present role of the teacher. This is a long-range approach to develop a widespread job differentiation and to rationalize the various functions of the educative process. Meanwhile, the present development of subprofessional roles, in my judgment, should be continued and expanded on an experimental basis.

It is imperative, I believe, given the need for experimentation, to prevent premature ossification. Therefore, all attempts to develop certification or licensure for nonprofessionals should be resisted. I think that this is something that calls for immediate action, in view of the natural propensity to move toward certification and licensure of new positions. Legal obstacles should be removed, if they exist in various states, to allow for experimentation in the development of subprofessionals.

I believe that the use of subprofessionals in education will only be facilitated if such use is justified in terms of the organizational goals and self-interests of those currently in the field. The argument of providing employment for the poor, in my judgment, is not an effective argument in terms of moving the profession. I believe that the following points constitute an acceptable rationale:

1. There is a desperate need to expand and improve services in education. This is a field in which the satiation of demand is so far distant that there need be no fear that people will work themselves out of jobs.
2. Since labor resources are scarce, we need far greater efficiency in the use of personnel.
3. The use of the subprofessional will enhance the professionalism of teachers. I would suggest here a complementary move which might involve a gradual elimination of the provisional certificate in education. Unlike the other professions, education has met its needs for expansion by the granting of provisional certificates to people who are not really certified and qualified to teach. It would seem to me that this would be a *quid pro quo* in exchange for the use of the subprofessional in education and would provide teachers, for the first time, an opportunity to control the source of supply of teachers and entry into the profession.

Another issue, in my judgment, which must be resolved is the development of career lines, in terms of job and function. I don't think that this is something that can be tackled in its entirety for the whole field of education. I would suggest here a movement for the securing of funds for a highly visible school system to encourage that school system to begin the development of career lines in certain aspects of the educative process, serving as a model for other school systems to contemplate. Possibly this might be broadened to include several important school systems charged with the job of developing alternative models in the use of subprofessionals.

There is always the issue of formal education versus the ability to perform the task and the specific training required for entry level jobs. As one might expect, the natural prejudice in education is toward formal education. Hence, it would seem to me, that from the point of view of strategy, it is important to begin the development of entry jobs that do not require a high degree of formal education. To do so, the jobs must be ones for which the needed skills can be explicitly defined, and the ability to function satisfactorily readily determined. I suggest that the more abstract the subprofessional job, the greater the resistance of the professional would tend to be toward the reduction of formal educational requisites for the job.

I believe that the move toward the development of the subprofessional will be enhanced when the education profession is forced to become more achievement-oriented than status-oriented. In order to become achievement-oriented, it is necessary, then, to become involved in the measurement of the quality of the output, which as all of you know is extremely difficult in the area of education. Yet, if the output of subprofessionals is judged by their jobs rather than by the measurement of the entire output of the total educational enterprise, this becomes a more manageable concept, one that might be a handle that can be used to stimulate the use of subprofessionals.

There is also the responsibility of the organization to provide training and facilitate movement along career lines. I would suggest that the stimulus here is the continued use of categorical Federal aid in this direction, which would then provide the basic stimulation and incentive for school systems to carry on this function.

Some of the issues, I'm convinced, might prove to be illusions. A rapid expansion of subprofessional jobs requires a source of labor. In the current tight labor market, the only sizeable untapped labor pool is the poor. A sizeable expansion of nonprofessional jobs will of necessity require the hiring of the uneducated, the untrained, and the poor, who will then require training and education.

In brief, in my judgment, the fullest development of the role of the subprofessional requires the establishment of an effective demand for the services of the subprofessional. To establish such a demand requires, first, the reduction of areas of resistance by indicating that it is in the self-interest of the professional to move in the direction of the employment of subprofessionals. Second, there must be a greater rationalization of the delivery system in education. Third, there must be a move toward job differentiation. Fourth, there must be a development of job prerequisites in terms of the actual requirements of the specific job. Fifth, there must be relevant training and education of workers. Sixth, there must be the development of an adequate incentive system. And seventh, there must be the securing of adequate financial resources in order to do the job.

In view of the recent rapid expansion of subprofessional roles in education and assuming continued categorical aid and an acute shortage of labor, it is my judgment that the trend of expanding the use of subprofessionals in education will inevitably continue. To me, the basic question is how quickly will this expansion occur, and how rational and efficient will the process be.

THE SUBPROFESSIONAL AND THE PROFESSION OF PUBLIC WELFARE

William H. Robinson
Director, Department of Public Aid
Cook County, Illinois

I have learned a great deal at this conference and, as a result of what I have learned, I have developed certain plans. As a result, these remarks will revolve around the question: "What are my next steps?"

As some of you may know, I became the Director of the Cook County Department of Public Aid on February 6, 1967. I found no blueprint for my orientation, so I made one and then gave myself six months in which to become oriented. I also made a few other arrangements. I arranged for the biggest snow in the history of the city of Chicago and, as a result, almost immediately had to develop a disaster plan. Shortly thereafter I arranged with the union to have a strike which lasted for seven weeks. Then I was invited to this conference, and trembled that the strike might last and I would have to miss the conference. In short, my period of orientation became a sort of baptism by fire. But the snows have melted, the people are back at work, and I am at this conference.

What has this conference meant to me as a new administrator in the area of the development and employment of subprofessionals? First of all, let me say that the Cook County Department of Public Aid already employs subprofessionals. The conference has not convinced me of the need for subprofessionals; I was already convinced. But it has provided me with new insights into the use of subprofessionals and strengthened my convictions about policymaking concerning those among my staff who are subprofessionals.

Among the more important of the subprofessionals in the Cook County Department of Public Aid are the Housing Aides. They act as assistants to the Housing Consultants and are the ones who do the leg work of investigating and checking on violations of the building code. They are the ones who provide the evidence and the material used by our lawyers to file complaints in the courts. In short, they have been crucial to the whole program of obtaining better housing for welfare recipients. Behind their employment lies a story. When I was in the legislature, I was chairman of a committee that studied public assistance throughout the country. As a result of that study, I introduced a bill which was passed and became law. It provided that rents might be withheld from landlords whose buildings did not meet the requirements of the building code. When I became Director, my first pronouncement was that top priority would be given to providing better housing for welfare clients in Chicago. Therefore, the Bureau of Housing became the focal point of my activity. No sooner had I made this pronouncement than the whole program was endangered due to cuts in the funds of the War on Poverty under which the Housing Aides were financed. It immediately became apparent that we needed to employ these people on a permanent basis. Their disappearance would have meant crippling the program.

At the same time that we were engaged in this type of activity, the legislature had a Commission on Slum Housing which had investigated housing throughout the state. The Commission introduced a series of 42 bills in the legislature, many of which were based upon the experiences in Cook County. They attempted to cover up the legal loopholes that existed in the withholding statutes (these landlords are very artful at dodges) and also gave more power to the persons who carried out the inspections. As a result, the Housing Aides became still more crucial to the whole program of obtaining better housing.

These events and this conference have helped me to see that we need not only the continued work of these Housing Aides, but we also need to upgrade them within their subprofessional category and to increase their salaries appropriately as they perfect their abilities. I now recognize that within the subprofessional category there is and must be a role for career growth and improvement. The subprofessionals cannot merely be stopgap appointments. I have, therefore, resolved to ask the State Department of Public Aid to give adequate allocations for Housing Aides. I plan to appear before the Legislative Advisory Committee to ask and encourage it to support the State Director in doing this.

During this conference the recruiting of subprofessionals was discussed. I should outline for you briefly the procedures used in Cook County. In brief, the Housing Aides are recruited from among the recipients. All recipients who are considered employable are first required to register with the Illinois State Employment Service. After that they are referred to the Welfare Rehabilitation Service of the Cook County Department of Public Aid,where they are screened and tested. The Supervisor of the Welfare Rehabilitation Service was instructed to look for persons who might fit into the category of Housing Aides. These persons were then assigned to the Housing Consultants and given a brief training period. As I have said, they soon became our first line of attack,and many of the things I have heard during these days at the conference and at the bar with the experts have led me to seek improvement of the role of the Housing Aides and also to open up other positions in the Bureau of Housing so that the Housing Aides will have an opportunity to move up and achieve status in the area of a new career.

But the Housing Aides are not the only subprofessionals at work with us. The Bureau of Home Economics also recruits and trains many women recipients to serve as Homemaker Aides and Housekeeping Teachers. The former enter homes with, for instance, ailing mothers, and care for the families until the mothers are well. The latter are sent to teach recipients with grave housekeeping problems how to keep their houses clean and neat and how to prepare good meals. Many of these people were brought up in rural areas where they were not taught many of the things needed for living in an urban environment. Many others have moved into public housing from slums and need orientation and training in this new setting. The program has also worked hand-in-hand with the Housing Aides. Many landlords complain of poor housekeeping by recipients and use this as a ground for refusing to rent to them. But now they can complain to the Housing Aides who then refer the case to the Bureau of Home Economics, which makes arrangements for a Housekeeping Teacher to give lessons or, where otherwise possible, to enroll the recipient in one of the classes in Urban Living taught by professional Home Economists. Nor are we merely passive. We do not wait for a complaint. When the Housing Aides are in the field investigating living conditions they watch for poor housekeeping practices and make reports and referrals that catch the problem before the complaint can arise.

The improvements that I have previously outlined with regard to Housing Aides apply also to the Homemaker Aides and Housekeeping Teachers. They also should be upgraded and a career ladder component built into the program. We now have a good basis for this since we now have an allocation of 155 slots for such people.

In addition, this conference has convinced me to work more strenuously to secure case aides, whom we do not have in Cook County. We need them. I shall ask the Department of Personnel to take a hard look at segmenting what the caseworker with a baccalaureate degree actually does. Some of this work, I am convinced, can be done by subprofessionals. I do perceive a threat to persons with baccalaureate degrees in employing case aides, but I think the time is ripe to introduce this idea -- particularly in Cook County where the recent strike has created a great backlog of work.

Some of the memoranda which I have received from the state capital indicate that redeterminations are at this point extremely necessary. I will admit that I have modified my language a bit because of the presence of some people here. But, quite frankly, I am talking about the employment of two-year college people from the junior colleges for case aides and building into this category the kind of subprofessional step-by-step roles that, hopefully, will stimulate some to continue their education. The brightest of them, I would hope, will move beyond the baccalaureate degree into the social work field to receive a Masters of Social Work degree.

As a direct response to this conference and its stimulation, I shall try to design an experimental scheme to involve "out-of-school, out-of-work youths" as subprofessionals in the Department. A private foundation has funded the Blackstone Rangers (a nationally known Chicago gang) in a training program. Oscar Brown, the entertainer, is now directing a drama and entertainment program with them and he has found some very bright young people in this group. I hope that by consulting with the sponsors of this conference I shall be able to work on a project with these "out-of-school, out-of-work youths" and to introduce them into the human services provided by the Cook County Department of Public Aid.

How shall I keep and expand the number of aides we have? How shall I make arrangements for other such aides? How shall I develop an in-service training program? What strategy shall I employ? Well, for one thing, many of these aides are members of the Independent Union of Public Aid Employees. One of the strategies will be to enlist the support of the Union in creating the kind of pressure and contacting the kinds of power structures which can help to unleash the power necessary to promote these ideas. We should appear before the State Department of Public Aid and the appropriate legislative authorities to fight for these programs.

You must have some knowledge of the structure of public assistance in Illinois to understand this strategy. The Legislative Advisory Committee, composed of legislators, is the group that really determines, in large measure, the administration of public assistance in Illinois, and convincing them has much leverage for convincing the administrator of the State Department to accept new programs or to give new allocations. So it shall be my strategy to go in person before this committee. Having been in the legislature, I know some of them. At the same time, I will take along union leaders and thus give the Department an opportunity, in a natural and appropriate way, to work with the union for a common objective. Of course, they cannot object because these subprofessionals are their members,and this is the way to handle a few more check-offs of union dues for them.

Before the Advisory Committee, we shall present the argument that, for instance, the homemakers represent services to the aged, that homemakers keep families together when the mother is sick or the mother is absent from the home, and that homemakers are people who otherwise would be on public assistance. Therefore, their employment can save big money. And if the bills now before the legislature pass, we shall be able to engage in even more significant preventive social services. Then, I hope, we shall be able to pull together the union, the State Department of Public Aid, and other state officials into a conference to discuss the whole question of subprofessionals and their future training. Finally, I hope that we can also include in that group the Chicago Chapter of the National Association for Social Work.

I would like to make one other comment about the strategy of securing these aides -- particularly Housing Aides. You probably know that during the summer of 1966, Chicago was a focus of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference movement. Martin Luther King was there with his slogan,"Clean up slums." Chicago was very much sensitized on housing. The strategy here will be to mobilize the already prevailing current public opinion around slum housing and work with the unions of welfare recipients, who likewise are concerned with slum housing, and with the Conference of Leadership for an Open Metropolitan Community which consists of the business associations concerned with open housing. In the attack on slums, we will also need to work with the Building Department so that the city, the Public Aid Department, and the Mayor's Commission on Human Relations can become a coalition that will indicate the significance of having Housing Aides to do this work.

And finally, the strategy for case aides falls within the framework of our current need: the vacancies which we have not filled and find difficult to fill, and the backlog of necessary redeterminations. Here again I shall involve the union. Here are potential new members. Here is new manpower. Union members have a fundamental objection to working on uncovered caseloads that require redetermination. If we can get case aides, we can help to overcome this objection and help clear up this backlog of work.

Finally, in summary, the conference has given me new insights into methods to improve and strengthen the subprofessionals already on the job. I have been stimulated to reach out and argue more forcefully for case aides, to design a project for the involvement of "out-of-school, out-of-work youths," and to introduce a career-ladders concept into the already existing subprofessional groups, including therein in-service training with continuing emphasis upon education and mobility towards adequate status. With your help and advice I hope to carry out these programs.

The Discussion Afterward

The panelists' presentations sparked a lively response on the part of all participants. For many administrators the logical next step was to reassess current operations within their own departments on the basis of conference formulations. A few selected statements give the quality of this approach.

- -- A welfare commissioner: "We use many subprofessionals and what I'll bring back from this conference are some of the nuances. I think I'll ask our people to take a look and see if they are dealing with the long-range implications, particularly of building career lines, and whether the training is based on the needs of people, or whether we are merely filling jobs."
- -- A school superintendent: "We have been committed to the use of supportive personnel for many years. This conference has been most effective in removing some blinders we have been guilty of wearing. I refer particularly to the career concept, with which I have been most impressed. I will bring back to my colleagues the results of this conference, and urge a more sophisticated approach to this process."
- -- A mental health commissioner: "As a result of this conference, I have 100 ideas that ought to be tried out. What I would like to see is some staff time set aside to battle with specifics. This is too promising an avenue for our sprawling departments to let weeks and months slip by without some action.
- -- A public health commissioner: "We employ a variety of subprofessionals in small, scattered public-health situations. I now see there are some things we could do. First, strengthen and refocus some of our in-service training which has been limited to professionals and, second, provide tuition assistance and released time for those who could move up."

Several participants emphasized the use of available training resources in more imaginative, constructive ways. A few commented that they would seek closer collaboration with existing vocational-education institutions in their community. A welfare commissioner said: "I realize we've been helping to train more workers by using MDTA and other funds for health occupations than for our own field of welfare. This is a sort of rude awakening. I plan to work very closely with community colleges to introduce this concept to them." Another saw a similar need to "indoctrinate those in charge of a whole range of training programs with the concepts that have been developed here. I plan a division chiefs' meeting to get some agreement on what we can do."

Some of the health represenatives saw the issues raised at the conference as particularly relevant to new patterns of service delivery. As one said: "We're opening a neighborhood health center with a heavy job training and development component, and I hope to get them started from scratch on the basis of what I have learned here." Another promised: "I will work on this in my own department, but I think my involvement with comprehensive health planning at state and regional levels is more important. This movement is just beginning and may change the provision of health services. I think the things that have come out of this conference should be brought to the attention of the public health service by the

National Committee on Employment of Youth, particularly those involved in developing comprehensive area health planning. It would be important to get some of the fundamental concepts and guidelines into the initial formulation of these centers, and now is the time!"

A sizeable group proposed concentration on securing additional support at the local and state levels of government. One said: "I will focus at the municipal level. It is now evident that we must recognize interaction between our school system and training steps for developing personnel and the kind of jobs we need filled in all municipal services." Another declared: "Next week I will be participating in a meeting of state education agencies, those with primary concern for developing credentialing. I hope to introduce to them some of the concepts of subprofessional careers that must be planned for." A welfare commissioner focused on securing state approval of subprofessional job classifications, and to do so he proposed "to present our staff with the need to analyze jobs and present the concept to the state board. If we are not successful in getting approval from our state, I will try to get funds elsewhere." As one educator said: "We have learned recently about the tremendous effect a little education of state officials can have. What to do when we get home is to put some investment in getting the subprofessional issue on the programs of state organizations. Talking with the people in state departments, with legislators, are activities that may pay off tremendously." To stimulate state action in developing educational programs for subprofessionals, a commissioner of education suggested that the National Committee on Employment of Youth make available a copy of the conference report to all state vocational educational directors.

With respect to civil service, one representative stated: "Our immediate task is to get the decision makers to solve their manpower shortage by redesigning jobs. Only then can we help them." But a commissioner of welfare confessed to skepticism that the "traditional dependence on civil service and merit systems would work." He recommended that the Manpower Administration of the Federal government take on the job of pulling together the knowledge relevant to subprofessionals -- selection criteria, training facilities, etc. -- and saw the problem as "getting the money for manpower -- a job that probably needs five billion dollars."

Most participants recommended activity at the Federal level to improve or modify existing appropriations and regulations. One suggested that public employers establish personal contacts in order to gain new legislative action. The major concern was more stable funding, allowing for or mandating advance planning and training. As one said, "The trouble now is that the money is the softest of the soft. Federal money should be used as seed money, as part of a long-range planning with solid support." Another commented: "New legislation should place the responsibility for training equally on schools and universities, so that the schools don't have to go to the universities with their 'hat in hand'."

As the workshop discussions proceeded, the welfare commissioners evidenced concern about the administrative and legislative controls of the current use of subprofessionals. Assurance was given by those representing the Federal welfare authority that regional representatives will be encouraged to stimulate subprofessional employment.

A general view, as one participant put it, was: "The Federal government has a lot of resources that already provide funds for training and job creation. I would worry hard about how to get some of that dough into subprofessional programs, and also to use such funds as Title III of the ESEA for free-flowing research. I would worry about the possibility of redirecting some Neighborhood Youth Corps funds into learner-job subprofessional contracts. Maybe the National Committee on Employment of Youth could spend just a little effort on compiling the Federal funding sources. There is room for much experimentation under existing funds." Not only compilation of the pertinent legislation that provides either permissive or substantive support for subprofessional employment, but also general information about staffing patterns was considered necessary. As one participant said: "Despite all of the establishments, Federal, state, and professional groups, there is a tremendous lack of information. People in Los Angeles don't know what's happening in Chicago. A big contribution that the National Committee on Employment of Youth and others can make is to see that the interesting new ways of using manpower resources gets disseminated to all state agencies."

Those who represented professional associations, unions, or professional education, were particularly impressed with the need for intensifying communication in professional journals and at association meetings to "lay out on the table the issues concerning subprofessionals." Participants registered their intention to include the subprofessional concept in the agenda of their associations. They urged meetings across professional lines, bringing together interested groups. A specific recommendation was that the competing teacher organizations, the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers, meet to work toward mutual understanding and commitment to the subprofessional concept. One school superintendent said: "I do not believe that there is as much internal dissatisfaction with subprofessionals as it appears when the subprofessional becomes a political issue. I believe that groups such as NCEY must bring together the national organizations to prevent this issue from becoming a divisive one at a time when our services are so much in need of developing subprofessional personnel."

Several found a special impact in the interdisciplinary construction of the conference. One said he "recognized more strongly than before the full impact of the interrelationships of health, education, and welfare." It was their view, in which many of those in government concurred, that closer relationships of these three groups and other human services would help not only to dissipate professional resistance but also to present constructively the rationale for subprofessionals to the community at large. As one suggested: "There is a need for a marketing or a public relations approach because many administrators and academicians are unsophisticated in this area. Perhaps funds should be made available for marketing and public relations to create the demand, and then transmit this demand in a

2

positive light to the community."

Again the concern with the anti-poverty approach was voiced, for example, in the view of one city official that "the attitude that this whole thing is a make-work approach for the poor will destroy public support." It was the consensus that transmitting the service and manpower goals was a priority. Systematic dissemination of information and discussion of the issue in periodicals and mass media were needed, as well as broad-based support, developed through community organizations and coalitions of civil rights and urban renewal groups, groups concerned with youth or with the aged, and all other civic groups, to promote the use of subprofessionals.

After the Conference

Two months after the conference, NCEY sent a questionnaire to each participant asking what new activities he planned or had in operation, what additional reactions he might have, and what additional recommendations he would like to make. Although only a short time had elapsed since the conference and it was a period during which many of the participants were on vacation, approximately half responded.

Several of the responses disclosed plans for new subprofessional jobs, either through the use of a variety of Federal funding programs or as a result of direct budget allocations. Some administrators are working with local junior colleges to develop new training and new ways of granting academic credits for work experience, so that those already employed as subprofessionals can be promoted. One has formulated a career ladder plan for a state mental health system. Another reported the establishment of a new case aide position in public welfare, "although we had to use a clerical classification to get these jobs on board."

A number of the questionnaires revealed renewed efforts to obtain revisions in civil-service procedures, particularly those pertaining to the ways in which examinations for subprofessional positions are given. One health commissioner has planned a series of departmental workshops to review the ways in which existing subprofessional roles may be expanded. In one welfare department, Neighborhood Youth Corps trainees are being used to investigate violations in slum housing and a career plan is being developed around the department's casework functions. It will establish the new position of casework assistant, which would be linked to on-the-job training stations and a new curriculum at a community college. An educational institution reported a study under way of possibilities for new curricula, for new relationships between the school and programs for the employment of subprofessionals.

Some conference participants who represented professionals have been instrumental in making the subprofessional a specific focus of summer meetings, notably those of the American Federation of Teachers and the Association of County Welfare Directors. Others plan, as one said, to "highlight the importance of subprofessional careers at future meetings and in publications." There have been some requests for NCEY materials and for participation by NCEY staff members at meetings aimed toward resolution of conflicts or toward development of training and employment programs.

Information and technical assistance, administrators reported, is their major need. They want information on policies of other states, examples of programs, the facts about funds for training, and about new types of training. A welfare commissioner wrote: "It appears to me that it would be extremely valuable if NCEY would act as a central clearing house, keeping us informed about programs, demonstrations, statutory provisions, and all relevant information in this important area of responsibility." Technical assistance to "design proposed changes in civil service specifications," to "suggest tasks that can be performed by subprofessionals," and the needed education and training modifications were mentioned by some. One commissioner of health replied that "the development of a career ladder is a very time-consuming operation. It would be helpful to have the benefit of NCEY or others who might be consulted for detailed information."

As to the impact of the conference discussions, from the vantage point of some elapsed time, there were many general comments to the effect that participation "crystalized my thinking" or "gave me an appreciation of the urgency of the need for more extensive planning for the employment and career development of subprofessionals." Some comments were more specific. For example, one welfare commissioner stated: "The conference made me more conscious of the total frame of the employment market, or what can be done by civil service systems if they try, and provided me with some specific examples of effective subprofessional use. I have followed up on two, in particular, that give promise of being helpful." Several, upon reflection, considered that meeting with groups outside their normal contact, in other professions or other fields of work, was, as one said, "particularly useful in coming to grips with the fundamental issues."

The major impact appears to have been on the commitment to the career concept. This was mentioned most frequently, and was emphasized by one respondent, who said: "There has been a marked expansion in my vision of the scope of career possibilities, and this has strengthened my conviction that the use of subprofessionals is not only desirable for better utilization of staff but essential if we are to cope with present needs and manpower shortages."

RECOMMENDATIONS

For as long as serious consideration has been given to the expanded use of subprofessionals in the human services, it has been recognized that such expansion would require changes that reach far beyond the subprofessionals' immedate co-workers or job site. Efforts to predict the activities that will be required by what was foreseen as a wide range of problems have been limited, however, because experience with the design of subprofessional opportunity has been limited.

A major contribution of the conference was that it started with the existing experience and added to it the practical considerations that must be confronted by the employers in established service mechanisms. After studying and evaluating this combination of considerations it is now possible to construct a fresh analysis of the problems to be overcome and their relative importance. From this analysis flows the following prediction of the activities that will be called for if the expanded use of subprofessionals is to enrich the quality of services while it offers realistic careers to subprofessional workers.

The primary need is for the design and testing of new models of subprofessional employment, models that will meet the needs of public employers and provide satisfying job opportunities. Current models make too limited use of subprofessionals or are too remote from the realities of public employment to be useful. Also, the existing models are not structured to make use of available information that relates to established service patterns and public employment, or to develop additional information that is sorely needed.

Simultaneous with the development of models of employment there will have to be more effective efforts to overcome the many kinds of resistance to subprofessionals. Without such activity it will not be possible to put the models into practice or to implement them effectively. Although we list overcoming resistance as secondary to the design and testing of models, it is clear that the two activities are in constant interaction and either may precede the other chronologically. As resistance is overcome, it may become practical to attempt the implementation of some particular use of subprofessionals. As new models provide new information, this information may become the key element in removing a particular regulatory barrier or an objection by other employees.

Finally, there must be a climate in which the expanded use of subprofessionals is not only possible but is encouraged. Existing resources such as funding programs and educational or other supportive services must be better adapted to the needs of the subprofessional and his potential employers. Where the needs are totally new, new resources will have to be provided. Again, there will be interaction between this phase of activity and the previous two. New models and lessened resistance will suggest the kinds and amounts of needed resources which will, in turn, further help to diminish resistance and will indicate what new models of subprofessional utilization are needed.

I. New Models

Through the development of new models can come the answers to the questions that arise when any human service contemplates an approach to its service and manpower problems through the use of subprofessionals. Such questions include job design, task differentiation, the criteria for the selection of candidates, and the procedures for the promotion of workers. The answers will have to be concrete and tested alternatives to traditional job classification and personnel credentialing systems. Only in relation to models that are appropriate for service and manpower requirements, can there be clarity about the nature of specific resistances. Only after such clarity is reached, can the needed changes be proposed.

Two general types of models will be needed to account for the range of situations that now exist. The first type will have to be designed to fit into the existing framework of human-service structures, allowing for the expansion or improvement of service within current goals. The second type will be aimed at the use of subprofessionals in totally new patterns of service delivery either to accomplish new service goals or to achieve existing goals where it is found that they cannot be accomplished through modification of an established service-delivery pattern.

Current service systems and institutions cannot be disregarded. Although their scope and quality of service may not be considered entirely satisfactory, they have strengths and advantages that cannot be ignored. To replace all of them quickly would be impossible, and to deprive them of the possible advantages of subprofessional utilization can only deprive their clients of better service and many potential subprofessionals of an opportunity to work. Furthermore, they have the advantage of a recognized role and community support. They probably can offer larger numbers of jobs in a shorter period than can systems that have to be created in their entirety.

On the other hand, it would be equally unwise to limit the use of subprofessionals to existing service and manpower patterns. This would restrict subprofessionals to such careers as can be devised in relatively immobile structures focused on professional staffing of service systems. Similarly, service output would then be limited to what can be accomplished without altering the focus on professionalism. A service system that is new either because it provides a new kind of service, or because it reaches an unserved group in the population, provides a better opportunity for testing the more imaginative uses of all kinds of manpower. Within it, new specialties and new connections and progressions between and among specialties can be created. The more conventional subprofessional models will probably have to be tested in such settings.

Models of both types can make important contributions as independent entities. For maximum effect, however, they should be designed with a view to their interrelationship within the totality of service output. They can be a source of mutual learning and can help counteract the increasing trend towards fragmented care. Moreover, if they complement each other to create more comprehensive human-service systems, they are likely also to produce a greater variety of jobs and work levels within a given field of work, thereby allowing for increased worker mobility.

Models must include a job and career design, a supplying mechanism, and the connections with established personnel systems and policies. Effective career models must be more than a description of a single hierarchy listing tasks to be performed and education or experience required for each level. They must deal with the dynamics of service creation, the ways in which different levels combine in operation to produce services. They must also include the means by which people are brought into the work and developed for each job. They must provide the paths to other jobs within the employing organization, or to other organizations or other fields of work, and the techniques for assuring movement along these paths. No model is complete unless it indicates how new staffing patterns or new service systems can be adapted to meet existing regulations or, alternately, the changes in administrative or legislative policies required. For all models, there are certain key elements:

Entry jobs must be discrete work levels designed as part of staff development.

> The design of entry levels is crucial if subprofessional jobs are not to be inherently terminal. The tasks may be simple and concrete but must have sufficient occupational content to give them integrity and allow them to serve as testing or training stations. The tasks at entry should be either a group of related activities that develop particular work skills or a planned variety of functions to test aptitude for a range of jobs. A well-designed entry job is one in which satisfactory performance is evidence of capacity for higher levels or broader scope of work. Recognizing that for some workers the entry job may remain the permanent work level, the jobs must be designed to be sufficiently productive, at least after experience and training, to justify a decent living wage. For many service components, models that seek to attract men must, in the design of entry jobs, attend not only to wages and upgrading, but also to status in relation to other jobs and to other personnel and to the nature of supervision.

Career ladders must provide sequences and gradations of skill and responsibility that allow for worker mobility.

> Occupational hierarchies that create wide gaps between levels, or in which the varying levels are not related in skill or service produced, tend to become discontinuous. Ladders should provide alternate tracks and varying points of entry.

Differentiation between levels and categories of work must be based on standards of output.

> Valid distinctions depend on the design of measurable standards of performance. Only against such standards can the alternative merits of education, experience, or individual aptitude be evaluated and recognized in promotion or increments of salary. And only on the basis of accepted realistic standards will skills acquired in one job be transferable to other jobs or occupations.

Recruitment must reach the desired manpower supply. Selection criteria must be relevant to subprofessional performance.

If youth or unemployed and underemployed adults are to be attracted, new recruitment sources and methods are needed: outreach activities and relations with schools, programs for out-of-school youth, and public or voluntary employment services. New models intended as male careers need special recruiting methods to counteract the prevailing feminine image in many areas of human-service work.

Selection criteria and methods must be linked to experiments that can determine the capacities actually needed for satisfactory performance in a job or job sequence. Only on the basis of such information can there be created the alternate measures of ability and potential that are needed to replace the current reliance on years of school, seniority in a job, or ability to pass intelligence, information, or aptitude tests.

Training, education, and on-the-job supervision need to be synthesized into a flexible instrument for continuous development.

They must be appropriate to the work, accessible to the worker, and must allow for combinations of work and study. An important element in any model is how the work experience, training, and education components are accredited towards requirements for higher or different levels of work.

Changes required by the model in existing personnel systems or alternates to that system must be established.

If the model is intended for use within the jurisdiction of a civil service system, it is likely that changes will be needed in hiring procedures, examination techniques, job classifications, and wage scales. The changes must be clearly worked out in advance and the procedures for accomplishing them must be known. Where the changes require new legislation, rather than administrative changes, all the elements involved in achieving such change must be taken into account. Before they are hired, subprofessionals should be informed that their career opportunities may depend on such change if the change has not yet been made.

The designing and testing of the new models will require the systematic accumulation and evaluation of all existing experience. This will have to be an interdisciplinary effort, since much of the relevant experience may not have been gained in relation to subprofessionals or what are recognized as subprofessionals. In addition, there will need to be new research consciously directed toward the problems raised in the design and testing of subprofessional models. Technical assistance will have to be made available to the designers and the testers and adequate opportunities will have to be provided for the testing.

All experience with differential use of varying categories of staff must be collected, analyzed, and evaluated.

What little literature exists on the use of subprofessionals lacks consistent nomenclature and conception. Few recent experiences with subprofessionals have been evaluated to provide convincing data documenting the subprofessional's contribution to the service output. Much potential information of value is unreported or, if recorded, is unpublished. Allocation of functions among levels of personnel varies with the community or the agency. These variations in practice offer a potential laboratory for assessing the merits of already tried staffing patterns. The proliferation of special employment and training programs under Federal grants or other short-term funding continues, with virtually no provision for systematic recording and interpretation of findings. Activities within the private sector in industry and in commercial and personal services should be studied for possible bearing on new uses of subprofessionals in the public and non-profit sector.

Existing information needs to be gathered, interpreted, and presented as it applies to the needs of human-service employers. Collecting and evaluating experience must be a continual process to produce readily available, up-to-date materials.

New research is needed to develop the knowledge for designing subprofessional careers.

Major gaps in knowledge are the areas of work that can be performed by subprofessionals, the skills required for the work, methods for predicting or determining which individuals have these skills, and techniques for developing the required skills. Established personnel systems based on academic education are difficult to modify unless alternative criteria and methods for initial selection and promotion are designed to test for job-related skills. New methods of training and education must be devised that produce the actual skill and personal attributes necessary for service work and which are, in turn, related to service needs. Methods of evaluating performance and accrediting work experience on the basis of accepted standards must be developed.

Systematic research on these key issues must be planned and conducted to supplement existing information and test intuitive or empirical judgment. Appropriate research design is an imperative. Some may be experiments and demonstrations of new service systems and new staff use. Others may be the careful scrutiny and job analysis of current practice to determine skills actually in use and the possible reassignment of functions to augment or improve service output.

Technical assistance must be provided to employers in the human services to enable them to improve current operations or implement new models.

Few administrators have adequate staff, time, or funds for planning, developing manpower innovation, or for negotiating with all interested groups to secure approval and cooperation. To translate service goals into optimal manpower models, these employers require the assistance of manpower experts, community planners, job analysts, curriculum specialists, training and personnel specialists, and other specially skilled people.

Technical assistance requirements can be filled by direct staffing of major human-service organizations or by providing them with access to a range of consultants.

Ample opportunities must be provided to test and evaluate new models within the service delivery system for which they are intended.

Tests of models must be of sufficient scale and duration to permit evaluation of service output and career development. Short-term crash programs must be supplemented with demonstrations guaranteed a longer life, with planned-for and built-in evaluation. For tests to be accepted as valid, support from internal and external groups that will be affected -- current employees, their associations and unions, civil service, merit

> systems or other personnel regulatory agencies, budget departments, and the schools or training institutions -- must be assured. Testing models without the commitment that action will follow the findings is unlikely to produce change.
>
> Models must be tested against the actual service goals and the goals must be clearly understood. Moreover, the goals must be ones that are in fact tested by the demonstration. When demonstrations are designed to test broad social change without regard to the specific contribution of subprofessionals employed, their findings are not a fair test of the potential of subprofessionals.

Within each service, in addition to broad principles relevant to any subprofessional in any job, there are particular substantive issues which must be taken into account in the design of a model: the health services' interest in attracting more men, education's overriding concern with whether subprofessionals can be used in the instructional process, and welfare's desire to integrate the range of social services into career sequences other than the one-track casework hierarchy. Specific issues that need testing depend to a great extent on the particular local conditions in individual service settings. Imposing an unrealistic issue, unrelated to actual conditions, would be unfair to the subprofessionals involved, a waste of limited opportunities to test the subprofessional potential, and a disservice to the concept of subprofessional utilization.

Many of these issues and some possible models are discussed in the advance papers prepared for the conference, particularly those entitled Education and Careers in Human Service and Selected Models of Subprofessional Careers, and throughout the workshop discussions. The papers and summaries of individual workshops are included in this report.

The following are some of the ideas that might be tried, but individual administrators or policy boards must judge carefully whether for their institutions the suggestions are appropriate ones.

Health

> Can the physical and bureaucratic complexities of large health institutions, which now restrict patient care, be eliminated or at least mitigated by subprofessionals in such tasks as: using a knowledge of the institution and the client population to see that patients get all they need or can use of available services, or to report the need for and help plan new services; checking why patients miss appointments or do not follow medical advice; checking what has happened to patients after they are released and determining whether they need additional care?
>
> Can aides improve service in functions between those of technician and physician, or between various technical and social-service levels?
>
> Can new and valid sequences of job complexity and promotion provide better services in laboratory, operating room, and other specialized services?

Can valid sequences be created in such managerial functions as record-keeping, purchasing, and the various general and specialized supply services?

Can subprofessionals be incorporated profitably into the staffs of comprehensive community health-care institutions? Can they staff or help staff such new mechanisms as mobile health-education units, recuperation centers, geriatric centers, etc.? Can they provide in-home services, not restricted to housekeeping, to reduce the demand for hospital beds?

Education

Should subprofessionals be involved in the instructional process as full-time assistants to the teacher, or can they take responsibility for groups or sub-groups of students with periodic supervision by the teacher?

Can the instructional process be divided, with the teacher responsible for introducing new material and the subprofessional providing drill and reinforcement?

Can the use of subprofessionals be combined with new arrangements of classrooms, new arrangements of seating, to improve the effectiveness of instruction? Can they be used in new divisions of the school day between in-school periods and instruction away from the school during field trips, work-study arrangements, etc.?

At what levels and in what ways should subprofessionals be used in primary education? In secondary education? How can these tests include the investigation of various methods of determining instructional productivity?

Can a sequence for subprofessionals be created among such non-instructional functions as preparation of instructional materials, care and operation of audio-visual equipment, aides in school-based health and social services, family-school coordinators, library services, etc.?

Welfare

Are there possibilities for constructing subprofessional career sequences within the casework process, and within the eligibility determination process?

Does the use of subprofessionals as homemakers, housing aides, expediters, and in other categories of practical service lend itself to career sequences within a broad range of social services?

Can the totality of service and the various related disciplines -- group work, community organization, and casework -- be integrated to form a unified personnel structure? Can a team concept be applied to embrace the various aspects of social service?

II. Overcoming Resistance

Resistance to manpower innovation has many facets. Resistance can be explicit in regulations prohibiting employment of persons without specified credentials; it can be the articulated opposition of particular groups to broadening the subprofessional role; or it can be a generalized resistance to change, an inertia characteristic of large bureaucracies. The last form is less frequently recognized as a barrier to overcome. It is manifest, however, when, as is often the case, those in policy-making positions stress the obstacles to and the difficulties of change, or when they consider other fields more suited to new approaches than their own.

Activities designed to overcome resistance must take cognizance of its varied forms. It is not enough to deal only with the clearly visible rules and laws that stand in the way, or to negotiate compromises with antagonistic groups, although both are indispensable to a fuller use of subprofessionals. Stimulating the leaders of such groups to fulfill their leadership role in new service and manpower approaches must be an important element in the activities to produce change.

The design and testing of new models is of itself valuable in counteracting the tendency to accept current practice as the most practical, if not the best. Providing top management with the information, research, and technical assistance to develop new manpower plans and the flexibility to experiment and evaluate alternate modes of organizing work can be a stimulus. For enough significant models to be implemented and their findings accepted, there is an additional range of activities needed to diminish antagonisms and encourage the modification of those policies that inhibit new uses of personnel. Much resistance of all types is engendered because of inadequate understanding of the extent and urgency of service and manpower needs and of the subprofessional potential. An effective network of communication that distributes accurate and appropriate data can dispel some of the misconceptions that exist even in sophisticated circles.

Data that document service and manpower needs, and the issues in the subprofessional concept, must be systematically developed and distributed.

> Statistical and interpretive information on the unmet needs of the population for jobs and services must be refined and brought to the attention of those directly concerned, and the general public as well. Manpower data similarly are in need of development and distribution. Personnel needs for the human services, most often calculated in terms of current service provision and occupational hierarchies, do not indicate the service needs or the potential alternative uses of manpower. The inadequacy of current levels of employment in terms of the number of jobs that provide opportunity for individual development and reasonable earnings must also be presented.
>
> The term subprofessional itself and the concepts fundamental to developing subprofessional careers are not consistently used or understood. The issues are obscured in discussions of antipoverty programs, minority problems, or other social or political matters, and the subprofessional concept is seldom put forth as a long-range manpower instrument.
>
> Systematic distribution of data and discussion that sets forth the manpower issues must be made throughout the range of professional and trade journals in the human services, and addressed to all categories of personnel, including educators or professionals. Until administrators and professionals are convinced of the urgency

of service needs, and of the dim prospect for filling existing job openings or providing sufficient jobs for the population, there will not be sufficient impetus to experiment with a fuller use of subprofessionals. To reach the public through the popular press and mass media also may be desirable, but caution should be exerted not to subject the public to mass dissemination of imperfect knowledge.

Major interest groups must be directly involved in promoting and implementing the subprofessional concept.

A first step is to reach the leaders of all related unions, associations, and regulatory and political groups to encourage them to assume responsibility for expanding their membership's concerns beyond the specifics of current operations. A concerted effort is needed to place on the agenda of all meetings of those groups directly concerned with service provision the issues integral to the development of subprofessionals. The objective should be to get these organizations to form special subcommittees to work towards reconciling conflicting interests and viewpoints.

New alliances of existing groups must be formed to resolve conflicts and develop support for the subprofessional concept.

Local, regional, and national task forces should be formed to coordinate planning. One type can include representatives of all personnel within a service, or all human services, in a community. Another should consist of organizations whose objective is to promote the improvement of health, education, or social services. NCEY's experience suggests that interdisciplinary groups are particularly effective for coordinating the planning of new occupations and are less likely to narrow the focus to a single occupational track.

New groups, of subprofessionals themselves or of citizens solely concerned with the subprofessional, may need to be formed.

Because many existing organizations within the human services have commitments to a profession or to a particular group to which subprofessional concerns tend to be subordinated, totally new organizations may need to be constructed to promote subprofessional interests in the political arena and to gain public acceptance. Careful consideration should be given, as the numbers of subprofessionals increase, to whether including them in existing unions and associations, or creating separate organizations, will best meet their needs. An alternate possibility is for service-improvement groups, representing citizen interest in the quality of service, to take on the advocacy of the interests of subprofessionals within the area of the groups' concern.

III. Strengthening and Augmenting Resources

Although full development of the subprofessional potential for meeting national service needs undoubtedly will require substantial increases in public expenditure, strengthening current programs can be beneficial, even within current levels of spending. There are two principal resources, outside established human-service employing institutions, for stimulating subprofessional job creation and developing appropriate personnel. They are the Federal anti-poverty and manpower programs and the schools.

The following steps are recommended for full use of both these resources:

Allocations of public funds to established human-service institutions must permit employers to adopt a flexible manpower policy.

Current regulations tend to inhibit innovation or experiment with new types or new levels of staff to fill already budgeted but unfilled positions. Funds for professional positions filled on a provisional basis, or by high-turnover staff, might be better utilized if administrators were free to use the same funds for new categories or different work assignments. Welfare administrators, for example, find it difficult to employ any but college graduates when the rate of Federal reimbursement is lower for work performed by anyone without a college degree.

Employment of subprofessionals by anti-poverty programs must be modified to provide models for new jobs in the traditional employing institutions.

Funding must allow more lead time for planning and staff development, resources for training and evaluation, and should be available for longer periods of more certain tenure. Funds offered under OEO, ESEA, and other laws should concentrate on programs creating more than one-level subprofessional jobs, with preference given where plans for permanent adoption of successful new models have been made. The ultimate goal should be permanent legislation as a resource for developing subprofessional manpower.

Manpower programs, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, the Job Corps, MDTA, and others should be directed towards new categories of service occupations and not only towards developing workers for existing jobs.

Special training programs for out-of-school youth and adults could serve as a training resource that might provide the stimulus to employers for developing new subprofessional roles. For maximum impact, training programs should be designed in collaboration with prospective employers, in conjunction with the design and implementation of new models.

All Federal legislation that supports education related to human services, and vocational education in particular, must be directed, at least in part, towards developing workers for existing jobs.

Present funding of higher education and professional education supports primarily the traditional academic curricula. Funds should be earmarked for subprofessional preparation, and especially for experiments with accrediting work experience and on-the-job training towards the requirements for higher levels of work. Urban universities and community colleges can play an important role in revising credentialing policies so that they do not depend exclusively on academic credits and are relevant to the demands of subprofessional jobs.

Secondary general and vocational schools can become the recruiters and trainers of potential service workers. To do so they should experiment with new curricula, core programs for the human services, specialty training, and new combinations of school and work experience. Vocational education could become a major instrument in preparing subprofessionals if Federal funds are earmarked for this purpose.

The U.S. Office of Education should take the initiative in assuring that education is a continuous process that provides connected curricula for subprofessionals from secondary schools through higher education. Federal tuition support must provide more opportunities for candidates for subprofessional jobs, or for those already employed, to study while gainfully employed. Free tuition or student loans will not meet the needs of those who cannot forego current earnings.

The activities needed to design and test new models and to overcome the obstacles to their implementation may require new resources that do not now exist. Resources, and support for them, are needed to provide the following functions:

Information Clearing House

To collect and distribute proposals, reports of training and employment programs, and information on existing resources, including those available under the terms of Federal legislation.

Research and Development

To formulate basic research issues, appropriate research design, and evaluate findings. To stimulate demonstrations that test research issues and the acceptance of their results.

Technical Assistance

To make available the range of expertise needed by employers, educators, trainers, or governmental bodies.

Public Information

To prepare and distribute literature, place articles in journals, plan conferences, develop task forces. To develop inter-agency or interdisciplinary communication, and plan and coordinate activities. To develop the organizational strength essential for effective promotion of and lobbying for the subprofessional concept at Federal, state, and local levels.

The preferable institutional form for supplying these four functions might be single-purpose or comprehensive centers that offer all four functions, national or local institutions, or institutes that serve a particular human-service field of work. An attractive possibility is the creation of a public human-service careers institute to coordinate information, research, technical information, and publicity Such an institute, with call on a range of experts in public administration, professional education, personnel policies, labor-management relations, and legislation, could act as the nerve center for promoting and systematizing the various activities aimed at developing significant subprofessional careers.

One potential resource that should not be overlooked is the group that took part in the NCEY conference. To capitalize on their commitment to and understanding of the current issues, they should be involved in task forces within their own communities or fields of work, or in further interdisciplinary planning sessions. Many are eager to act on the conference formulations and should be supplied with the information and technical assistance they clearly perceive as their need. At minimum, those who attended the conference should be allowed the opportunity to do what they considered most urgent -- to "hard sell" the subprofessional concept to other agency executives who may not see manpower or service needs as sufficiently critical to warrant innovation.

THE SUBPROFESSIONAL SCENE:
ADVANCE PAPERS FOR THE CONFERENCE

CURRENT LEVELS OF UNDERSTANDING

In all human endeavor, knowledge appears to outdistance application. This is noticeably true of subprofessional employment. Understanding of the issues has improved markedly in the 1960's, well beyond the actualities of the employment of subprofessionals. On both sides of the ledger -- the manpower needs of human-service institutions and the employment needs of the population -- there has been a considerable evolution at the conceptual level. Leaders in health, education, and welfare, as well as in related fields, no longer view subprofessionals as expedients for temporarily filling existing vacancies, but see them as a vast untapped manpower resource with long-range potential. The concern with job creation has evolved from providing immediate employment for the poor to developing meaningful and satisfying careers open but not necessarily restricted to the poor. And yet, in permanent employment by major institutions, as well as in temporary, specially-designed and funded programs, virtually all subprofessional jobs are low in status and pay, and are deadends.

From a review of the literature, the proceedings of the multitude of conferences in service fields, the reports of task forces, advisory councils, and experimental programs, and from discussions with leading service administrators, program planners, scholars, and other experts, it is apparent that the current level of understanding concerning the subprofessionals includes at least five identifiable elements:

1. Professional and skilled manpower is now inadequate in number for staffing the current patterns of service delivery, and these positions cannot be filled by existing training facilities.
2. Improvements in the patterns of delivery in order to increase the quality of service generate manpower needs beyond those demanded by the current patterns of service delivery.
3. The manpower problem must be solved to meet the rising needs of the population, which demands decent levels of service as well as a viable solution to the number one domestic problem -- poverty.
4. Employment opportunities for large numbers of unemployed and underemployed persons, representing avenues to satisfying levels of work and earnings, are unlikely to open now or in the near future solely through anticipated levels of economic growth or conventional open-market interaction.
5. To develop adequate amounts and levels of work for the population requires new patterns of planning, action, and coordination on the part of a range of institutions and agencies concerned with the demand and supply of manpower.

These concepts underlie both the widespread acceptance of the subprofessional idea and the recognition of the need to develop plans for closing the gap between understanding and practice. The development and expansion of the use of subprofessionals, while not the whole answer, appears to be a most promising instrument for meeting simultaneously some of the manpower, service, and employment needs.

The Manpower Shortage

Few topics have received as much attention as the shortages of professional personnel. The problem is not new, but concern with it is mounting and taking on new dimensions. Discussion no longer is confined exclusively to an enumeration of professional vacancies. There is an apparent consensus that these shortages are a chronic condition, not susceptible of solution by intensified recruitment or short-range crash programs. The emerging view is well put by Mitchell Ginsberg and Bernard Shiffman:

> Whatever the profession, these shortages cannot be met by simply recruiting more students, expanding or setting up new schools, providing more fellowships, raising professional pay, and the like. We are all in favor of these steps and believe they should be pushed vigorously; at the same time, we ought to recognize that they are not enough. By and large, the professions are competing mainly for the same people, and the supply is and will continue to be inadequate to meet the demand.[1]

The obvious conclusion is that new kinds of manpower will have to be found and developed on something more than a stopgap basis.

Manpower data available in the three fields has its limitations. Although it substantiates this conclusion, it does not give more than a general estimate of the magnitude of the need for subprofessionals. Projections are generally based on current employment structures, making it difficult to determine with any precision the types and levels of personnel that might be required should staffing policies be reshaped. Moreover, many consider that because such projections are based on current levels of service, adjusted only for population growth, they probably minimize the actual needs. They fail to account for the higher levels of demand, both quantitative and qualitative, generated by changes in national expectations.

The health field is, of course, by far the largest in the three major human services. It accounts for over 6 percent of the Gross National Product and employs some 4 million persons. Health services, moreover, are recognized as one of the major growth industries in the nation. Recent Bureau of Labor Statistics projections envision a total increase in health manpower by 1975 of 44 percent for growth and replacements, to be made up of 140,000 more physicians, 390,000 additional professional nurses, 310,000 practical nurses, and 690,000 aides, orderlies, and attendants. There are other estimates ranging upward to the prediction that total employment in health will double by 1975.

---

[1] Mitchell I. Ginsberg and Bernard Shiffman. "Manpower and Training Problems in Combatting Poverty." Law and Contemporary Problems. Duke University School of Law. Vol. 31 (Winter 1966) p. 173.

The nursing, or patient-care sequence employs the greatest number of auxiliary workers, and at the same time suffers from the most acute shortages of personnel. The current deficit of registered nurses is usually given as 125,000. The National League of Nursing predicts that based on the annual output of the nurses' training schools -- a total of 35,000, many of whom do not enter the field -- the deficit may reach 344,000 by 1970. To eradicate the deficit, they estimate, the number being graduated each year would have to triple to meet the 1970 goal, and this is a pre-Medicare estimate.

The shortages are not distributed equally among institutions. For example, in New York City there are now only 3,200 registered nurses for 8,500 positions in municipal hospitals, a vacancy rate far higher than the 16-percent national average. Nursing homes, public health service agencies, and visiting nursing organizations are also desperately understaffed. Nor is the geographic distribution even. According to a Public Health Service estimate, some 500,000 health workers would be needed to bring the ratio of personnel to population throughout the nation up to the level of that of the northeast.

Personnel shortages in mental health are equally or perhaps even more acute. State hospitals suffer from an inability to compete effectively for professionals of all types. The bulk of patient care is supplied by psychiatric aides and the estimated 100,000 currently employed in state and county hospitals is thought to represent only half the number needed by 1970. Moreover, the National Institute of Mental Health projects the establishment of 1,000 new community mental health centers throughout the country by 1970.

For professional social workers, the gap between the need and supply is already wider than can be met by normal recruitment or available training facilities, and is widening annually. There are an estimated 10,000 to 12,000 current vacancies in already budgeted positions. Some 15,000 are needed annually to replace those leaving the field and to staff new services provided by recent legislation in child care and health. Filling the vacancies is clearly impossible in the face of an annual total of graduates from schools of social work of some 3,500. As for the near future, the most frequently quoted statement is that of the HEW Task Force on Social Welfare, Education and Manpower:

> The estimates from agencies within the Department of Health, Education and Welfare suggest a need in their programs alone of approximately 100,000 social workers with full education by 1970...[1]

The same report estimates a need for more than 50,000 additional workers to staff public family services, of which one-third should be professionaly trained. At present only 4.5 percent of those employed in public assistance programs hold

---

1. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Closing the Gap in Social Welfare Manpower. Washington, D.C. Government Printing Office, 1965. p. 41.

graduate degrees in social work.

The departmental task force report, in common with that of most social welfare groups, focuses on professional staff needs and makes no attempt to calculate the demand for other workers, except to emphasize the need for vastly increased numbers both of college graduates and for the development of several categories of technical and ancillary workers. And yet, these candidates will of necessity fill the majority of jobs, especially in public welfare agencies. The college graduate without professional credentials is now the mainstay of those agencies.

The inadequate supply of social workers extends beyond public welfare and is characteristic also of corrections, of services to the aged and the handicapped, and of social work departments of schools, hospitals, and similar institutions.

The figures reported in education are not as dramatic, but the indications are that after a period of relative balance, the supply of teachers is running dangerously short. According to U.S. Department of Labor estimates, the number of teachers in elementary and secondary schools will have to increase by at least one-fourth from 1.7 million in 1960 to 2.2 million by 1970 to take care of the anticipated growth in enrollment. The 1.5 million new entrants expected in this decade will suffice only to replace a like number expected to leave the field, with a resultant deficit of 500,000. These figures do not provide replacements for the estimated 100,000 teaching posts now filled with uncertified personnel.

The impact of teacher shortage is greatest in the large urban centers. New York City, with a total instructional force of 54,220, needs an annual supply of 6,684 new teachers simply to replace resigning and retiring staff. And of the total, 17,588, or 32 percent, teach under substitute licenses. According to New York City's Superintendent of Schools, Bernard J. Donovan,

> There is a tremendous teacher shortage throughout the whole nation, and we have been more fortunate in our coverage than have the other large cities.[1]

In all fields the magnitude of shortages is increased by the high rate of attrition and turnover. A considerable portion of staff is new to the occupation or the agency, and many are passing through on their way to other endeavors.

From the numbers in the three fields alone, it is possible to envision 1 million additional potential jobs by 1970 or 1975.

Improving the Quality of Service

When to the projections of numbers needed are added considerations of quality, still greater numbers ensue. For example, the nursing profession considers the formula that provides safe and efficient patient care to be provided 45 percent by professional nurses, 30 percent by practical nurses, and 25 percent by aides. A 1962 estimate found professional nurses providing only 30 percent of patient care, on the average, and concluded that the recommended formula is clearly not attainable.

---

[1] New York Times, March 20, 1967.

The proportion of public school teachers with substandard certification is increasing. It has risen to 5.1 percent of the total full-time force as compared with 4.8 percent a year ago. This average conceals the variations in the large urban centers where both the demands and the requirements are higher, and probably understates the number. In many cities school facilities are inadequate and pupil loads are well in excess of 100 percent of capacity. In most urban centers, class size averages are higher than deemed desirable by most experts, including the teachers themselves. It has been estimated, for example, that to reduce by five students the class size in a city as large as Detroit an additional 2,000 teachers would be required.

Similarly, case loads in all public welfare establishments are running higher, often almost double the generally accepted maximum, a fact that has been the subject of considerable attention in recent labor disputes. Few states are likely to meet the Federal maximum caseload requirement of 60 as of July 1, 1967.

But such formulations alone are dubious measures of quality. Where studies have been conducted it has been found that changes in ratios of personnel to the population, class size, or case loads, are not, by themselves, productive of major qualitative changes. The amount and quality of service provided by a profession is not related simply to the number of professionals within it. The tasks they perform, and the organization and delivery of services, are being recognized to be at least equally important. As frequently noted, the United States has the highest ratio of health personnel to the population, but not the highest health level -- it stands 11th among nations in the world in major health indices.

Although there may be no absolute correlation between the number of workers and the quality of services, the consensus is that manpower shortages have impaired effectiveness throughout. For example, Robert L. Barker and Thomas L. Briggs, in evaluating the social-work literature on personnel problems state:

> The underlying effect of the manpower shortage for which there appears to be universal agreement is that social agency programs cannot be fully carried out, and that all the clients needs, and needs of potential clients cannot be met. The shortage has the effect of making it impossible, or difficult for agencies to develop those programs which they know would be needed, or even to fulfill the very functions for which they were organized. Furthermore, it means that even for the clients who are ostensibly served by the agency, the full range of their needs cannot be met. Rather, only a few of their needs tend to be focused upon.[1]

The major emerging qualitative concern is the maximum effective use of personnel. This has two facets. One is the underutilization of professional talent through the expenditure of professional time in the performance of nonprofessional tasks. The other, a reciprocal factor, is the underutilization of those capable of being trained for subprofessional work levels.

---

[1] Robert L. Barker and Thomas L. Briggs. Trends in the Utilization of Social Work Personnel: An Evaluative Research of the Literature. National Association of Social Workers, Research Report No. 2, under NIMH Grant MH-1420, June, 1966.

That professional talent is wasted is a generally accepted belief, of which only a few pertinent studies exist. For example, there are reports that doctors spend from 30 to 70 percent of their time in functions not requiring their full training; and nurses, one-fourth to two-fifths in non-nursing functions. Although the precise dimension of this waste is not known, some view the current estimates of manpower shortages as grossly overstated as a direct consequence of misallocation of staff time. While it is generally agreed that many could be trained to form effectively some of the tasks now the province of professionals, at no greater hazards than those engendered by current understaffing, the precise potential of the subprofessional resource is undetermined.

With respect to the professionals, the use of subprofessionals is advocated for reasons of efficiency and a more economical use of talent. It is also seen as a method of improving the quality of professional services. If the use of auxiliary staff frees the professional from the miscellany of routine and less demanding tasks, the effect on professional quality may be substantial. Besides conserving time, new orders of staffing may permit modification of the multi-purpose roles most professionals now play, eliminating areas not germane to their profession: medical personnel in clinics, for instance, spend uncounted hours on social rather than medical problems.

A new and improved division of labor might, in addition, serve as an impetus to the development of professional career ladders of specialization or differential work levels. The resultant increases in job satisfaction and promotional opportunities might attract and hold more of the professionally trained to human service, and the resultant increase in professional productivity and promotional opportunity could justify a higher initial salary and a wider range of increments. Such arguments are advanced by groups seeking to improve the status of teachers, nurses,and caseworkers.

It is clear that substantial impact on professional quality depends on substantial use of the subprofessionals. Many consider subprofessionals underutilized if they remain untrained, continuing to perform only routine clerical, physical, and custodial tasks. They call for the construction of subprofessional careers that permit advancement, at least to middle-level functions in direct service. Much current discussion focuses on the need for programs in vocational education and in the community colleges to attract better qualified and more stable employees to subprofessional entry posts, and also to upgrade the subprofessional through continuous training. Some view the creation of subprofessional careers as a possible source of internal staff development, eventuating in full professional status.

It is also widely believed that the use of subprofessionals offers additional opportunity for major revisions in the traditional modes of professional employment. Redistribution of functions without regard to existing professional structures might free the nurse from serving as a recording machine, break down the multi-purpose classroom teacher role into manageable work units, and allow social work to go beyond the traditional worker-client, one-to-one relationship. Through the construction of teams for other new patterns of staffing, a more comprehensive approach to service may develop, filling the gaps between the fragmented and isolated units of the current structure. Qualitative considerations transform the subprofessional job needs dictated by manpower shortages alone into the need to develop subprofessional careers.

The Rising Demand for Service

A recurrent theme of almost all service conferences is that money, which was hitherto considered the sine-qua-non for expanding services and which is now more readily available, will not, without appropriate manpower, suffice. For example, it is said that no state has as yet taken full advantage of the 1962 amendments to the Social Security Act. Title I of the Elementary & Secondary Education Act has highlighted the personnel shortages in education of teachers, social workers, nurses, remediation, and research personnel. Because of health personnel shortages, Medicare may be adding as much, or more, to inflating the already high costs of health service as it is to the coverage or quality of care. In fact, there are some who feel that no further Federal or other support for health services can be used to advantage until personnel is adequate and reorganization of services is effected. Most, however, do not see the two needs -- money and manpower -- as antithetical, but rather as closely related. Funds are needed to provide support for developing manpower as well as payment for services.

National expansion in the demand for services is the appropriate backdrop for assessing manpower needs. The goals are rising to include the expectation of decent standards of health care for all, education that serves the disadvantaged as well as the more fortunate, and welfare policies that end rather than perpetuate dependency. Admittedly, fulfillment of such goals will require sizeable funds, but there are steps that can be taken to make better use of funds now available and to assure improved allocation of future funding.

Recently enacted legislation such as the Nelson-Scheuer Amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act is beginning to provide a base for the development of permanent subprofessional careers. Among the proposed new bills or amendments to existing acts, there is apparent an expansion of training and development funds to include both the strictly professional and the subprofessional. This conference reflects understanding of the need to refine employment policies and practices in order to use such funds with maximum effect.

Not only is money insufficiently used, but knowledge as well. Medical techniques are available that would permit the reduction of institutionalization and increase treatment in the homes of residents or in community facilities other than hospitals for those who are physically and mentally ill. Technology already available could change the shape of education. Positive social services in the form of group work, counseling, and remediation might be of greater benefit to clients now offered only limited financial assistance. All fields aim to broaden their scope to reach the unreached, and to deal in prevention and rehabilitation, rather than solely in relief of symptoms or in custodial care.

To do this may require changes in the structure of services that will have implications for all levels of staff, and certainly for subprofessionals. Some leaders in health see a need to move from patterns of fragmented and disease-centered care to comprehensive community service that includes prevention and public health education. There are new directions in education and new types of community involvement for the adult, the disadvantaged, and the under-achiever. The scope of social work is expanding to planning and prevention, to serving not only specific categories of the poor, but all who need assistance. The expectation is that service demands will continue to increase, perhaps at an accelerating rate.

Some steps in new directions are already being taken. These steps not only increase the dimensions of service operations, but necessitate reshaping the patterns of staffing. Predictions of future manpower needs, based on current levels of demand, are therefore probably grossly understated, particularly for the subprofessional.

The Need for Additional Employment Opportunities

A study of unemployment in U.S. cities and slums, recently released by the U.S. Department of Labor, indicates the ambiguity of traditional unemployment figures.[1] The old figures, averaging slums and suburbs together, hid the magnitude of the problem in the areas of its concentration. When the usual measure of unemployment, which excludes those not looking for work, was applied to the urban slums in January, 1967, it produced a rate of 10 percent, compared with 3.7 percent national average. Rates higher than 10 percent were found in some cities. When a new concept of "sub-unemployment" was introduced, with many components, the average for 10 urban slum areas became 33.9 percent.

This is concrete evidence of the well-known imbalance between the quality of jobs available and the character of job seekers in slum areas. Until recently, the prevailing view was that unemployment or underemployment was largely a reflection of personal deficiencies. Efforts were concentrated on training or otherwise fitting the individual for existing jobs. The more contemporary view is that while personal deficiencies may limit employability for some, there are, even in periods of high economic activity, insufficient numbers of jobs that provide meaningful and satisfying opportunities for work at decent earning levels.

The difficulty of finding rewarding career opportunities, prior to completing college or professional training, affects not only slum residents but many in all socio-economic groups. The possibility of finding a niche in the human services is limited by the timing and setting of exposure to and preparation for work connected with the professions. The first opportunity to become acquainted with social work is in late college years, and few jobs are available to either social workers or teachers who are without a college degree or a full professional education.

---

[1] U.S. Department of Labor, A Sharper Look at Unemployment in the U.S. Cities and Slums. Released March 1967.

Nursing recruiting, until recently, has been confined almost entirely to the female high-school graduate, at the moment of graduation. The exclusion of minorities has been another factor restricting the potential supply. The necessity to acquire a specific set of credentials before working not only eliminates many who cannot afford to postpone their employment, but precludes entry at different points in time and manner. In all service professions, little opportunity is provided for youth to test vocational interests without making complete professional commitment. Such barriers affect not only those adjudged poor by current standards, but also those of various backgrounds who are unable to prepare themselves or to find work at their level of capacity and interest. Subprofessional careers can provide one step toward breaking the credential bind, allowing a variety of people to work within the helping services.

Because the job needs are obviously more urgent among the poor, and because many subprofessionals, especially in anti-poverty programs, have been employed in connection with services to the poor, there has arisen a tendency to equate subprofessional jobs with employing the poor. Much of the literature advocating subprofessional job creation has stressed the special attributes of the indigenous. The experience in anti-poverty programs indicates that being indigenous is not an automatic qualification for subprofessional work. When helper and helped possess similar backgrounds, positive values, indeed, result, but personality factors and work skills independent of ethnic or economic elements are at least equally important. Thus, while the priority for employing the poor is understandable in anti-poverty programs, the intent of subprofessional job creation expands beyond a strategy to create jobs for the poor.

The growing sentiment is that among the indigenous there are at least as many capable of subprofessional work as in any other group; more, perhaps, because of the limited opportunities for the poor to be other than menially or marginally employed. The problem is constructing jobs without barring those of disadvantaged background, while at the same time avoiding a second-rate, low-esteemed category of employment. An obvious need is a title that is neither "non" nor "sub" anything. A better title probably awaits a better job definition and perhaps better jobs, and a refusal to lump any new job, no matter how routine, into so broad a category.

The Need for Planning

In the past, it has been the pattern for occupations -- new professions or trades -- to evolve gradually by a process of self-differentiation in response to particular needs. This process still works reasonably well in areas where demand changes are gradual or predictable, the occupational structure is relatively fluid, the conditions of work are attractive, and the supply is capable of ready development in short periods or through already existing mechanisms. These factors often exist in the private sector, where organizations can predict or control the dimensions of demand to be met. It is especially true among the most prestigious business organizations in command of the job market, the new and rapidly growing fields where the anticipated rate of profit permits a high investment in manpower development, and the new areas that are free of the traditional barriers that impede progress.

Open market interaction in the professionally oriented service fields, especially in the public sector, operates with difficulty. For example, the demand for service, besides being expressed through legislation or political budgets, is not determined by institutional goals alone, but by a complex of societal responses to competing and conflicting goals. Changes in demand are neither gradual nor entirely predictable. They depend on a whole spectrum of national concerns, such as the impact on the total level of public funds and their allocation of defense spending, inflation, the articulation of public sentiment, or other factors. The rate of change in demand and its expression could be charted as a series of plateaus, interrupted at varying intervals by elevation to new levels.

The public sector, and to some extent the nonprofit service sector, have difficulties in translating this demand, when it occurs, into appropriate personnel. Both cannot, as in private industry, develop simultaneously. After the demand has occurred and been made effective, the scramble for personnel usually begins. The process is complicated by the built-in rigidities of structure, wages, and personnel classification of large organizations subject to bureaucratic control. Although the private sector has similar problems, they are not as great as those of institutions operating under line budgets, civil service, licensing, or legislative controls.

Administrative problems inhibit the ability to alter job requirements and wages in order to compete in the open market. This limitation is compounded by the long lead time and high investment necessary to prepare human-service personnel. Thus, administrators must generally resort to ad hoc responses and changes in wages or in job requirements, conceived as expedients and born in crisis, that only serve to complicate future action as the temporary becomes embedded in a permanent structure.

All of these impediments to manpower innovation have a particular impact on the development of subprofessionals. Although it is increasingly clear that we have probably reached a plateau in conventional techniques of personnel development for the professions, much of administrative energy is still confined to attempts to work within the already defined occupational classifications. The pressures of the overburdened and underpaid employees add to other administrative problems.

There are countervailing forces on the national scene, expressed by civic and political groups, in academic circles, and among special-interest segments, such as those in civil rights, health, and labor organizations, in anti-poverty, and, perhaps most importantly, among the human-service administrative leaders. There are even the beginnings of organization of subprofessional workers. All these forces promise to provide support for the changes needed to expand both the quality and quantity of manpower.

It is in response to these historic problems and new ideas, to the growing recognition of the need to devise strategies for manpower innovation that merge considerations of supply and demand, that this conference is addressed. Although some promising developments are scattered throughout the three fields, there is as yet no systematic, concerted approach. Without such an approach, the jobs and the supplying mechanisms that evolve are likely to build on, and thus reinforce, existing structures. Planning for subprofessional careers has been a part of the work of many of the related professional groups, including the National Health Council, the National Association of Social Workers, and the National Education Association. The recognized need for coordinated and comprehensive service, however, suggests that planning must be conducted in an interdisciplinary framework.

The evolution on the conceptual front has been considerable. The rationale for giving serious consideration to an expanded use of subprofessionals is strong. Moreover, it is generally recognized that only when subprofessional careers provide a distinct role for the subprofessional will they have a significant impact on the manpower shortages, the quality of service, and the employment opportunities for the population. But many unresolved issues, some of which are also conceptual, remain to inhibit implementation. They are evident in the current status of the permanent employment of subprofessionals.

THE CURRENT STATUS OF PERMANENT SUBPROFESSIONAL EMPLOYMENT

If we descend from the lofty altitudes of rationale to the level of permanent employment of subprofessionals[1] as it now exists in health, education, and welfare, we find that jobs are limited in number, and especially limited in the employment opportunities they afford. Programs throughout the country, under special funding, are exploring opportunities for subprofessionals in an innovative manner, but most often they are temporary and peripheral to the major service functions. At present, however, on the national scene, permanent jobs for those without considerable post-high-school education are almost all low-paying, low-status, deadend jobs, filled primarily by women. Opportunities for advancement to decent earning levels in direct service functions are, with rare exceptions, limited to those with recourse to full-time college or professional training.

The three fields are at different stages in the development of regularly-budgeted, permanent subprofessional employment. Health occupations are the furthest advanced, with sizeable numbers of subprofessionals employed. In the schools, the subprofessional is beginning to gain a foothold, but in social welfare, the subprofessional is still mainly a topic for discussion.

Health

The medical professions have demonstrated considerable ingenuity in differentiating work levels and standardizing requirements, job titles, and functions. Health institutions serve as training grounds for a wide range of paramedical and technical personnel, with some 20 to 30 occupations already in existence. Professionals comprise only a little over 1 million, or approximately one-fourth, of the total engaged in health services (doctors, dentists, and nurses), yet they remain the dominant although not the fastest growing segment. The increasing numbers of technical and subprofessional personnel, especially in patient care, is changing the occupational mix. From 1950 to 1960, subprofessionals -- aides, orderlies, and attendants -- increased 90 percent, to an estimated 800,000. The rate of growth in the health field has been roughly inverse to the skill level of the workers, and in all likelihood this pattern will continue.

A major limitation in health occupations is the essentially discontinuous occupational structure. Each work area and level is separated from others by substantially increased requirements in formal education or training, and often is subject to state licensing.

---

[1] Most auxiliary service jobs now in existence, and referred to by the variety of titles associated with what we describe as subprofessional, do not meet all the requirements of our definition. However, for purposes of discussing what has happened so far and to avoid further confusing the issue by creating yet another name, we refer to such jobs as subprofessional.

> Thus the hospital is a classic illustration of 'blocked mobility'. With the exception of a few opportunities for movement within a job category (usually at lower levels of responsibility, such as the shift from one classification of aide to another), medical advancement depends upon technical training which can only be secured through formal schooling in a setting outside the organization itself.[1]

A second major limitation is the substandard wages for the bulk of hospital employees. Nurses' salaries, for example, although recently increasing, compare unfavorably with those of classroom teachers. Working conditions and fringe benefits are also inferior. There is a disparity between the wages earned by health workers and the stringent demands upon them for skill, dedication, and willingness to work in unpleasant surroundings at inconvenient hours.

The impact of both the discontinuity and the low wages is inevitably the greatest at the lowest level. Although aides stand at the bottom of a hierarchy of related work, the opportunities for advancement have been few. On a higher rung of the ladder is the licensed practical nurse, whose job generally requires one year of full-time training. The next, the registered nurse, the professional in this sequence, must receive two, three, or the American Nursing Association goal of four years of additional preparation, with no credit for experience and no standard credits for prior levels of training. The routes to technical and administrative occupations are similarly blocked. The more recently developed jobs, such as home-health aides, who provide outreach services, are usually unconnected with other levels of work and often are described as suitable for older women.

The job of the aide. for which little education or skill is required, consists of a miscellany of simple and routine tasks in physical care and housekeeping, formerly a part of the work of a nurse. Training is primarily on the job and concentrated in the first few weeks of employment. With aides providing the major portion of patient care, the training deficiencies have been a matter of concern. The Public Health Service, in cooperation with national nursing associations, has prepared a training course which has been given in some institutions from time to time, benefiting several thousand aides. But thousands more have not been trained.

Subprofessional productivity is accordingly low, a factor reflected in wage rates, which hover close to the poverty level. It has been reported that in some areas those trained in MDTA and other programs were paid more as trainees under stipends than as subsequent employees. In nursing homes, where many aides are employed, the average earnings of nonsupervisory workers is $1.06 an hour.

Both the lack of opportunity for advancement and the marginal wages have only recently been recognized as problems for the employer. The traditional view has been that occupational discontinuity inheres in the nature of the work. As recently as 1964, when the National Committee on Employment of Youth conducted

---

1. Robert N. Wilson. "The Social Structure of a General Hospital." _The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences_. Vol. 346 (March 1963) p. 75.

a study of hiring and training practices in both the private and public sectors, hospital administrators were almost universally of this opinion. Moreover, they viewed their subprofessionals as unstable and untrainable.[1]

Recently this viewpoint has been changing. Solutions to the nursing shortage based on expediency have not been a total success. The use of untrained aides has diluted the quality of patient care, and has not alleviated shortages at higher levels. Most subprofessional jobs are sources of dissatisfaction to employers as well as to employees. This employment dissatisfaction accrues to the nurses as well. For example, the turnover rates are approximately the same for both registered nurse and nurse's aide -- a staggering rate of nearly 70 percent a year.

The lack of career ladders has become a focus of discussion in health manpower circles, a discussion that generally succeeds in exposing the difficulty of the questions rather than in providing answers. At present, the focus is mainly on registered nurses, especially as they press to upgrade educational requirements for their profession. But the need for connecting links throughout the job hierarchy, for possible reallocation of existing functions, or creation of new jobs, is being recognized.

The question of wages is equally difficult. Inflationary health costs, rising at a rate outstripping all other costs, are a critical national issue. With labor costs accounting for two-thirds of hospital expenses, there are strong pressures against wage increases. Many doubt that, in view of the shortages of personnel resources and training facilities, higher salaries will increase the supply or improve the quality of health care. On the other hand, there is a growing demand for increased efficiency in health organization, and increased productivity of health workers. This may lead to a reexamination of functions and of the way in which personnel are prepared and trained. There is evidence of a problem in nursing education, for example, when several hundred thousand of those trained to practice the profession either never enter the field or leave it after a few years of work, never to return.

Thus far, programs to ameliorate the problems of personnel have concentrated on expanding the supply in accordance with established classifications. Aides and practical nurses have been trained by MDTA programs, OEO, and vocational education, with larger numbers anticipated from these resources in 1967. Vocational education action has not measured up to expectations, at least not at the secondary-school level. The numbers trained are still small, and many question the value of training aides when the jobs offered are so marginal. It is the community colleges that lead in expanding the supply of health-service workers. To date, Federal funds for health have been concentrated on payment for health services or training for top echelons of manpower. There is widespread opinion that we are on the verge of a health revolution, and proposed or potential legislation may provide the opportunity for significant innovation.

---

[1] National Committee on Employment of Youth. Getting Hired, Getting Trained. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 1965.

Mental Health

A similar structure prevails in mental health occupations. A Department of Health, Education and Welfare study of the 96,000 psychiatric aides employed in state and county mental health hospitals, revealed that they are also low-paid (the median annual wage is $3,550), primarily female, and relatively untrained, unstable employees in deadend jobs. The majority are, however, high-school graduates. Although the aide is firmly established as an integral part of the staffing pattern, and indeed provides the bulk of patient care, there are but few promotional opportunities for them. Administrators envision a much wider scope for the subprofessionals, especially as they move from custodial to rehabilitative care. State hospitals are attempting to use the therapeutic potential of the attendants, but find these employees already overburdened with custodial functions.

The deficiencies in mental-health staffing are attracting increasing attention. The need for training and upgrading opportunities is a part of this concern. Governor Rockefeller in his budget address in February of this year recommended a career ladders program because

> At present too many persons, especially those in the nonprofessional categories, such as the 26,000 attendants, find that their promotional opportunities are limited. This leads to a waste for both the employee and the state -- a situation which should be corrected.[1]

Not only are the staffing needs of community mental health centers for programs of prevention considered critical but matters are further complicated by the lack of clear disciplinary connections within the wide range of skills connected with positive mental health services. It is recognized, however, that manpower must be drawn from other sources as well as upgrading current aides and attendants through in-service or work-study arrangements.

Although community colleges have been attracted to the needs in mental health, the present lack of suitable positions for mental health workers with a junior-college level of training inhibits the program. The consensus is that for subprofessional mental health workers to assume any real significance, they will need not only additional training but the concomitant development of middle levels of work now nonexistent.

Education

In the schools, the employment of subprofessionals is rapidly gaining momentum. Quantitative use of aides is expanding, especially under the impact of the Office of Economic Opportunity, Head Start, and Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act programs. No accurate figures are available, but there are approximately 25,000 part- and full-time subprofessionals employed and a substantial number in the 180,000 jobs created under Title I of ESEA.

---

[1] New York Times, February 2, 1967.

Aides are being used increasingly outside of special programs as part of the regular school staff, especially in elementary schools. Education spokesmen envision continued expansion, with the possibility that, in the future, aides will outnumber teachers.

The expansion is today primarily one of numbers. The role of the aide is hardly different now from what it was a decade or more ago when individual school systems enlisted volunteers or hired, at the discretion of a principal, a few workers who were paid out of local PTA or non-budgetary funds. The job is not standardized. Each teacher or principal defines it according to individual interpretation of a few broad guidelines. The aide is essentially an adjunct of the individual teacher or school administration, performing routine clerical tasks, housekeeping, or monitoring, and providing some limited direct service to children, most often in connection with their physical needs.

Even more limited are the opportunities such jobs afford. The usual work day is limited to three hours and the pay to the minimum hourly wage. Training is in an embryonic stage, and advancement, except through the normal process of teacher certification, is almost nonexistent. These are "pin money" jobs for local housewives or students, or in some cases interneships for those preparing for professional teacher status. The largest category comprises the "noon-day" aides, who provide lunchroom and playground supervision.

Two states have recently surveyed the employment of aides in their schools. Both note recent and rapid growth on a state-wide basis.

-- In Florida in 1966, among 1,871 aides employed the most consistent functions found were clerical workers or monitors of cafeterias or playgrounds. Some provided classroom assistance for teachers of large classes. The median wage was $1.25 per hour, with most counties paying a single rate and many jobs only part-time.

-- A recent New York State survey of 3,000 aides employed (exclusive of New York City) reports similar functions. Although some school systems employ other auxiliary personnel, such as instructional materials' assistants, library assistants, and lay-readers, these jobs for the most part are reserved for people with some or full college training. The wage in New York ranged from $1.59 an hour to $2.56 an hour, the college-trained receiving the highest pay. Of the total, 55 percent worked fewer than three hours per day.

More than half of the employing schools in both states require a high-school diploma as a minimum, and some require specific skills, such as typing. The New York study reports that 98 percent of the aides are women, the median age is 42, and that most are high-school graduates with experience in either raising or working with children.

The New York City job description for school aides encapsulates the job limitations. It has been said that the title "school aide" was chosen, rather than "teacher aide," to avoid the possibility of a certification process. The aide works under the direct supervision of a teacher or principal in tasks that do not require teaching or other professional skills. The job requires an 8th-grade education or equivalent and offers wages of $1.65 to $1.75 for part-time work up to a maximum of five hours a day. The line of promotion is listed as "none."

The problem here is fundamentally conceptual. The great divide between the instructional and the non-instructional function is a primary issue, a divide not clearly understood but nonetheless accepted and reinforced by licensing requirements. The instructional function is limited to certified personnel. A few states provide for an assistant level, designed for student teachers, but others preclude by law the use of any non-certified personnel in instructional tasks. Some states are revising statutes to permit hiring of aides and there is concurrent growing pressure to establish certification procedures for subprofessionals.

Some teachers' groups fear that the aide will become a cheaper substitute for teachers. In addition, a National Education Association 1967 statement emphasizes that jobs should not be created solely to provide employment for the poor. While there is concern over the dilution of quality, there is also some indication that the large percentage of uncertified personnel who function as teachers, and the sizeable numbers who are new each year to the system, reflect an already existing quality problem. Fuller development of the subprofessional in education, say its advocates, is related to a career continuum for teachers because the use of auxiliary staff can help to establish a sequence that extends downward and upward from the single-level, multi-purpose classroom teacher. The goal is greater differentiation and specialization of work levels in education.

Because of the tangle of laws and competing interests, the aide job has been defined more in terms of what it is not, than of what it is. Many feel it is still wise to avoid more specific definitions, and to allow each teacher to decide how his or her aide is to function. Although aides under a teacher's supervision are in some cases providing instructional assistance to individual children or small groups, in most cases the work is mainly routine or physical. Many appear to be maids or matrons rather than aides.

There is considerable enthusiasm for the teacher aide, based on benefits thought to accrue to children of an "extra pair of hands and eyes." From a manpower viewpoint, however, the jobs are in no sense career opportunities, except when they serve as internships for teaching students. Admittedly, the role of the aide is very new and the progress from a few volunteers to massive programs has been impressive, especially as a manifestation of growing acceptance.

Indications are that there is movement in the direction of refining the auxiliary role, since the lack of clear and standardized job designs is recognized by the Bank Street College of Education, among many others, as a major limitation to systematic training and development of subprofessionals. Pressure for a fresh look at the classroom teacher's role is mounting. Training programs are being instituted and models proposed, including an intervening level -- the assistant -- between the aide and certified teacher. There are many who feel it important also to break the "female only" pattern of subprofessional employment. Heightened public interest in education, the increasing involvement of the schools in the community, and prospects for additional Federal funds for the training of subprofessionals may, despite many unresolved problems, spur a more sophisticated use of the subprofessional.

The potential role of public education as a supplier of subprofessionals for itself as well as for other fields is largely undeveloped. Some schools are using high school students as tutors, not with any vocational intent, but rather to amplify remedial services and prevent dropouts. Health curriculum is restricted almost entirely to personal hygiene. A few health career programs have been initiated in some schools, but are too new to evaluate. The major educational thrust, primarily focused on technical or auxiliary health careers, thus far has been at the community-college level. Junior-college programs to develop social-work technicians and teaching assistants are being launched, but their impact is not yet felt.

Social Welfare

In the range of settings where social work is the primary professional orientation, subprofessionals, as this term is now interpreted, are an insignificant factor. On the other hand, professionals in any full sense are a minority. The Council on Social Work Education estimates that only 21 to 25 percent of those employed in social-work occupations hold graduate social-work degrees. In some agencies or institutions, only the Master of Social Work is considered a professional, while in others standards vary so widely that the term "professional" signifies only the person filling a professionally-rated job. The B.A. degree is becoming the minimum and the typical qualification of first-line caseworkers.

The title "case aide" or "case assistant," appearing with increasing frequency in the literature, has most often been established as the nonprofessional level in a professionally-oriented voluntary or public agency. Here the job is designed either to attract college students or graduates to professional careers, or is a personnel expedient to employ recent college graduates, who may indeed be headed toward other occupations. The anomalies of social-welfare staffing are such that the "nonprofessionals" in one agency may have more formal education and experience than the "professionals" in another.

This semantic confusion reflects the lack of accepted and standardized roles. In view of the limited penetration of the profession, it is not surprising that the major thrust of manpower activities has been devoted to increasing the number of professionals and upgrading the status of current employees. Only recently has the college level been established as a minimum recommended casework entry level in a wide range of social-work settings,including public welfare agencies. Now that the staffs of most agencies are better educated, although seldom totally professional in the full sense, they may be attaining sufficient status to consider further subdivision of roles.

Experience with the subprofessional has been confined largely to the use of volunteers by the nonprofit neighborhood house or to the employment by public assistance agencies of welfare recipients, as homemaker assistants at rather primitive levels. The evolution at the conceptual level, however, has been considerable, suggesting that social welfare might bypass the stage of developing subprofessional entry jobs without providing any career opportunities. The need for career lines is already recognized.

The delay in establishing subprofessional roles is attributed to the difficulties of defining specific auxiliary functions within a casework model, a model to which most professionals are committed. The idea of a differential approach toward social-work manpower is at least 20 years old. It was many years before a formulation of a two-career structure gained acceptance, and the theoretical basis of differentiation has continued to be modified. This is largely the public-welfare model -- the professionals with graduate degrees in supervisory functions and the college graduates trained by in-service programs as first-line caseworkers. Today, three- and four-level designs are being recommended, placing on the third level the technician with two years of college training. A three-level scheme is about as far as many professionally-oriented organizations are willing to go, but others, especially in public welfare, now project a fourth level to enlist the aide, frequently called the indigenous worker. The jobs for this level are generally limited to the homemaker assistant, child-care aide, or other low-level and peripheral functions.

In December of 1965, the Federal Bureau of Family Services defined, as a guide to local agency planning, two types of auxiliary roles, an administrative and a direct-service function. In each, there is one level for the junior-college graduate or technician. The administrative technician would work in research or statistics and the direct-service technician in tasks related to eligibility determination and social services for the welfare clients. The lower level for administrative work, information, and referral services is designed for a high-school graduate. In direct service, the lower levels are household helper and homemaker aide, for those without high-school education. There is no data on the numbers of agencies that have adopted these or other formulations.

Leaders in social welfare recognize that such schemes provide only a static view of job design and do not offer much in the way of subprofessional employment opportunities. Implementation has in many cases been deterred by the knowledge that the subprofessional jobs as currently conceived would neither serve agency purposes nor provide stable and non-marginal employment. A report of a California Welfare Aides Project states:

> The most pressing dilemma of the moment is that we have no way of hooking our fledgling career line into a solid career system, or better yet, several career systems. At present, our aides have

> neither job security nor accessible channels for horizontal or vertical mobility.[1]

But staff problems, especially in public welfare, grow more urgent. Pressures to move from strict adherence to a case-work orientation to the use of impersonal structures, group-work practices, teams, or other organizational patterns are increasing. Moreover, the emphasis of public welfare is shifting from a preoccupation with investigation to a focus on rehabilitation. In New York City two centers are already testing the possibilities of streamlined eligibility determination.

The critical manpower shortage, magnified recently by the burdens of Medicare heaped on the welfare worker, is intensifying the pressures for broader manpower resources. The simultaneous need for a range of services in job placement, counseling, skill training, and the like further increases the demand.

The profession has made great strides in its quest for theoretical job restructuring. The core question is whether such jobs as currently envisioned are discrete levels or are ranged along a continuum. The frustration faced by administrators and practitioners, unable to develop the programs they know are needed, may impel social welfare to overtake the early lead established by health and education in developing jobs for subprofessionals. All three fields together might then progress in some unified fashion toward a system of careers.

The experience in Community Action Programs, in special projects funded by Federal grants or by foundation money, the proliferation of new types of training resources, all may begin to have significant impact on the permanent institutions. There are already some promising demonstrations of new patterns of cooperation -- employers and schools, unions and schools, anti-poverty groups and the more traditional employing institutions. The search for models has begun and is, of itself, perhaps the most encouraging trend.

---

1. Dorothea Cudaback. Preliminary Report of Welfare Service Aides Project. University of California School of Social Welfare. March 27, 1967. (mimeo.) p.6.

EDUCATION AND CAREERS IN HUMAN SERVICE

The differentiation of distinct and meaningful occupations within the traditional divisions of labor in the human services is increasingly being recognized as a key element in the proper design of subprofessional jobs. As would be expected in professionally-oriented service fields, and as is increasingly the case in all employment, the distinctions between levels of staff are most often based on type and degree of formal education. The health field, often cited as a model of occupational differentiation, illustrates the close connections between education and occupation. Each occupation within the many specialties and subdivisions in health demands a particular preparation. Currently, most attention is focused on nursing, and the paramount issue absorbing the designers of policy relevant to nursing centers on the preparation of personnel. It is instructive to investigate the details of the current controversy in nursing because they illustrate problems arising, or likely to arise, at later stages of development in any attempt to establish subprofessional occupations in human services.

The position of organized nursing -- that training of nurses should be transferred from hospital-run schools to academic institutions -- has sharpened the focus. Underlying this controversy is a whole range of questions concerning the role of academic education in the development of service careers, including careers for subprofessionals. Does such education open doors to careers or does it encourage insistence on credentials that bar careers to those unable to obtain the required specific credentials? Can competence in performance be related to levels of academic education? What are the relative merits of training in specific skills or of general education in the development of career potential? These are difficult questions and, among those committed to new career concepts, there is ambivalence as to whether the best strategy is to attempt to break down systems dependent on educational credentials or to find ways to confer on all persons some relevant or acceptable accreditation.

The current training of nurses is complex and confused. Nurses are trained in one-year practical nursing programs, two-year junior-college programs, two- and three-year hospital diploma schools, and baccalaureate programs of four years or more. The diploma schools, still the principal suppliers of professional nurses, are dwindling rapidly in number of programs and enrollment. Hospitals are finding the cost of training unsupportable, and would-be applicants for these programs are deterred by the all-out campaign of the nursing associations to establish the baccalaureate degree as a minimum acceptable educational criterion for the professional nurse. Baccalaureate programs are growing, but growth is slow and the number of graduates is small. Only 5,498 were graduated from baccalaureate programs in 1966.

The major growth has been in junior colleges. The Associate Degree in Nursing, first offered in 1952, is now available in 190 programs. Last year, 13,000 received associate degrees, or nearly one-third of all nursing graduates. Junior-college programs were quickly accepted by state licensing authorities, employers, and the community. Undoubtedly, the shortage of nurses facilitated this acceptance. As free or low-cost tuition programs they are accessible to a broader spectrum of the population. Students include more married women, minority groups, and men -- groups largely unable to avail themselves of residential hospital training or the more demanding, longer, and more costly baccalaureate programs.

Organized nursing also accepts these programs. The position of the American Nurses Association is that the only nursing levels should be the baccalaureate and the associate degree, with the baccalaureate graduates as professional nurses and the two-year graduates as technical or vocational nurses. The goal appears to be that the two levels should ultimately supplant both practical nursing and diploma training. The professional nurse would have supervisory and administrative responsibility and function at higher technical levels than the ADN graduate. The justification for the viewpoint is that the quality of nursing will be raised to function within the increasing complexity of medical practice. Advocates of academic education contend that the professional nurse needs a liberal arts education to deal with her associates on the highly trained hospital staff and with other than the practical problems of patients.

The current stance of organized nursing is understandable. It is consonant with every occupation's desire to upgrade its status and professionalize its image. It mirrors the national acceptance of a college education as a minimum professional preparation and the academic degree as preferable to other forms of certification.

All health occupations have been moving rapidly into degree-granting programs. The technical institutes' one-year programs, training medical and laboratory assistants for work with doctors or in hospitals, are being transformed into two-year programs, adding a year of liberal arts to round out an associate degree. Colleges and universities are expanding their baccalaureate and post-graduate programs in medical technology and administration. According to Darrel J. Mase, Dean of the College of Health Related Professions at the University of Florida,

> Society now demands extended educational experiences as well as specialized skills. Whether the associate or advanced degree is necessary to perform the skills under supervision is not the issue. Education has been extended and the Federal, state, and other funding agencies will support degree-granting educational settings rather than non-academic certificate-granting agencies.[1]

The anomaly is that nursing is demanding academic degrees for all at a time when other service professions are questioning whether standard academic degrees should be the sole mode of preparation for service occupations. Some doctors, for example, suggest that the full MD training may not be necessary for all medical practitioners.

In essence, what the nurses are suggesting is a three-level occupation: the

---

1. From a paper presented to the American Public Health Association, November 2, 1966.

aide, trained on the job; the junior-college graduate as the technician; and the graduate or professional at the top of the ladder. This is not unlike the models proposed in social work and in education. The assumption is that three levels based on educational attainment and modes of preparation result in a hierarchy that permits the professional to divest himself of nonprofessional tasks and allows the employment of those without professional qualifications. And, as in nursing, other professions see no alternatives to progress up this ladder except through formal education.

Because of the widespread support for such a model it is appropriate to consider the experience with these various levels, already in existence in patient-care services. In general, the occupational significance of education depends on the extent to which it serves the interests of the employer, the clientele, and the workers themselves. In hospitals, at present, judging by the utilization of nurses with different types of preparation, employers either do not see substantial differences in performance between the graduates of different programs or, because of internal operating pressures, are unable to make such distinctions. Graduates of all types of programs are either used interchangeably or in patterns that vary with the geographical area or the institution. Although Associate Degree programs do not intend their graduates for supervisory or administrative responsibility, these nurses frequently serve in such capacities. Licensing practices generally distinguish only between the practical nurse and the registered nurse and subsume the ADN graduate under the category of registered nurse. Moreover, even such distinctions do not hold up in practice. Where registered nurses are scarce, practical nurses supervise entire wards, and even aides perform functions considered professional.

The lack of standard differentiation does not necessarily mean that there are no differences in competence among nurses attributable to training. It suggests that other factors -- economic considerations, the availability of personnel, and the modes of service delivery -- are perhaps more controlling. The mounting costs of hospital operations, and especially labor costs, and the scarcity of those with full professional training have been factors in the increasing use of personnel at the lower skill and wage levels. And the introduction of labor-saving devices such as computers may have additional future impact on the occupational mix.

The organization of services may be equally a determinant. When patients are grouped by economic status, rather than by the degree of care required, it is difficult to assign staff on the basis of skill. The extension of insurance coverage may make it possible to regroup patients, permitting the development and assignment of teams at different skill levels. Intensive care units, becoming a feature of many hospitals, are a step in this direction. As hospitals become more management-minded, moving into systems and job analysis, greater delineation of job differences that suggest needs for differential training may arise. But, for the present, there are no clear and consistent relationships between the different training forms and the work assignments of personnel.

The impact of different modes of training and education on the quality of service, the justification for emphasizing an academic background in nursing education, cannot be determined with precision. Conflicting opinions are voiced. Some hospital administrators maintain that the baccalaureate-trained nurse lacks the expected practical skills and cannot make a bed. The advocates of academic preparation counter that this is not the purpose of the training. There are others to perform the practical tasks, they say, and those trained only in practical skills are inadequate to the more sophisticated demands in nursing. They are not professionals but technicians who follow orders rigidly and who cannot note problems or suggest changes in treatment. Without performance standards and objective tests of measurement, claims for the merits of different types of training can be made, but not substantiated.

The benefits to the nurses themselves of expanded or academic training connected with their employment appear to be limited to earnings. Some wage differentials have recently been set up, providing higher pay for those with greater education. But these are arbitrary distinctions and, like others based solely on credentials, encourage the possibility that the minimum wage will become the maximum. When this happens, and when promotional opportunity and increments for competence are limited, there is the risk of protecting the mediocre and driving out the potentially superior. This is true of many systems whose salaries are based on educational attainment -- in teaching and social work, as well as in nursing.

Newly graduated baccalaureate nurses may earn more than practical nurses with substantial experience and merit. Moreover, because educational credits are the only possibilities for upgrading both status and pay, they stand as barriers to the development of many, possibly the majority of the workers. Employees within the entire hierarchy are frozen into one job level unless they can forego work for study in programs that make little allowance for prior experience.

The discontinuity in health occupations, and especially in nursing, is well known. Organized nursing is aware of this problem, and "career ladders" is becoming a watchword. The profession is unable, however, to suggest alternates to education that will implement the climb up the career ladder. For example, although the need to offer aides better training is recognized, it is not considered part of a continuing education process that would culminate in professional nursing.

It may be that at issue is a lack of understanding of the nursing role, which has changed markedly in the process of subdividing functions among practical nurses, aides, and attendants. Although the nurse is no longer primarily a direct-service agent, she still functions in bedside care, but her functions now include elements of supervision and administration and technical services as well. In other words, she is still a generalist and multi-purpose worker, even though she stands at the top of a hierarchy. The aide is also a generalist, performing a potpourri of tasks in housekeeping, food service, patient care, and clerical work. It may be that nurses, feeling powerless to create sufficient occupational distance between each of the several layers of multi-purpose workers, are seeking instead to increase the educational distance.

The implication is that the downward transfer of functions, on the basis of what appears to be the routine, or repetitive, or easily learned, may not result in anything more than artificial occupational structure that must be bolstered by credentials. What is needed is a division that results in jobs that at all levels are self-contained segments of responsibility. This is as true for the professional as for the subprofessional, for without it there can be no real status or sense of accomplishment. The problem is apparent among teachers and social workers who frequently make an effort to resolve the problems of professional development attributable to their multi-purpose roles by acquiring general purpose assistants -- the subprofessionals. Some educators and social work administrators foresee this problem, and are aware that extending the professional functions to others, without redesigning all levels, will neither make the professional more professional, nor give the subprofessional entry to a career.

In health occupations, there are some who suggest that the nursing functions can be separated into three discrete occupations -- patient care, technical and clinical services, and administration. Such separation, they claim, could provide progression from entry levels upward to higher levels than those now attained by most nurses. Full professional status, equivalent to post-graduate levels, could be developed through specialization in management or technology. Whether the entry level should remain a generalist's job is open to question. The recommendation, however, is that entry jobs should be constructed to permit the workers to acquire related work skills that test the potentiality for upgrading along different tracks. Of special significance is the possibility such a design offers for employing men in nursing occupations. While patient care and bedside nursing may be an extension of the maternal role, technical and clinical work and management might be open equally to both men and women.

On balance, it appears that career planning requires clear delineation of discrete work roles and their articulation within an occupational structure. Without such planning, training cannot be designed to facilitate the entry or the development of appropriate candidates. Education,when it becomes a precondition for work, must be scrutinized carefully to determine whether it is relevant to performance on the job and to upgrading potential, or whether it merely erects barriers for the exclusion of many.

Leaders in education are recognizing the limitations of ad-hoc programs designed in response to existing demands for workers. Education that is focused on one-level jobs rather than career development restricts the employer's ability to reallocate work and inhibits the worker's mobility. Such preparation may be of particular disservice to those trained, if their training is neither transferable horizontally to other occupations nor linked to upgrading sequences.

In relation to vocational development, education and training are, however, supplying mechanisms, conditioned by the way demand is defined in job opportunities. Educators at all levels are aware that the relevance of their curricula to employment depends on the extent of cooperative planning with potential employers. There are some who see a need for educational institutions to take the initiative to stimulate the development of patterns of cooperation.

Junior colleges or community colleges, as they are variously named, appear to be in the forefront of this movement. As young and rapidly growing institutions they are more flexible and can respond more readily to community needs. Their character has been changing, moving in the direction of comprehensive programs, embracing both basic education and vocational content. Some appear to be striving to become four-year, degree-granting colleges. With an annual expansion of 20 percent and an anticipated enrollment of $2\frac{1}{2}$ million by 1970, they are attaining a significant place in the educational structure.

The junior college has been considered by many a potential training ground for subprofessionals in human services. Although its precise role is difficult to define, especially in view of rapid and accelerating changes, certain developments may indicate the potential. Some junior colleges are, for instance, exerting their influence to alter job designs. As an example, the Essex Community College in Baltimore succeeded in effecting a reduction of the requirements for public-welfare interviewers to a two-year college course. They now are working with voluntary agencies to develop an equivalent position. While this may not be a subprofessional job, it is a step toward the creation of a middle level. Others are attempting to anticipate a need. The City College of San Francisco is training teacher assistants for pre-school and elementary schools in a free program of one or two years, open to all without restriction. Although no such full-time positions exist, the college is working simultaneously with the school system to institutionalize the role.

And perhaps most significant, the role of the junior college appears to be expanding from in-school pre-employment training to training and upgrading on the job those employed as entry subprofessionals. There has already been considerable experience in training aides in Head Start, Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and Community Action programs and in providing pre-service and continuing education in field-based or work-study programs. This not only assures that training meets the test of the needs of the job and the worker, but transforms education from a requirement for hiring to a benefit of working.

Colleges and universities as well are seeking connections with and leadership in the development of human-service personnel. One of the most comprehensive proposals is the Health Careers Center to be launched by the City University of New York. This center will offer post-graduate, baccalaureate, associate degree, and subcollegiate programs, will expand established programs and add new curricula, some aimed specifically at educating the disadvantaged. In addition to traditional health careers, programs will be offered to recreational, mental health, and social-work aides and environmental health-service personnel. The goal is to develop a coordinated educational system of work-study programs and academic training with counseling services to assure the maximum career development of students.

In addition, an experimental approach is manifest in some pilot programs.

One of the best known is the program at Duke University Medical Center that trains medical corpsmen as potential members of a health team in the new category, physicians' assistants. The program, instituted in 1965, has received wide publicity and is considered a breakthrough that might point the way toward establishing male careers without postgraduate training. The number trained is small, ten admitted each year, but the attractions are apparent in the 600 already applying for next year's class. The expectation is that at the completion of the two-year training there will be no difficulty in placing graduates. There have already been numerous inquiries from potential employers.

On the secondary-school level, progress has been slower. Government spokesmen have noted that few school systems have taken full advantage of the Vocational Education Act of 1963. Programs in health occupations are rare and scattered among isolated school systems. And programs in other fields are even less developed.

Interest in using the secondary vocational-school programs to develop human-service subprofessionals is growing, and a few school systems are planning or testing new programs. In New York City, for example, the Board of Education instituted, in the fall of 1966, a correlated curriculum project. Under Ford Foundation sponsorship it offers a health careers program as one of three new occupational fields open to the non-college-bound general student. The project, an outgrowth of an experimental training project in Richmond, California, preparing potential dropouts for technical occupations, aims at something more than a watered-down academic program for those who do not plan to continue beyond high school. The curriculum begins in the ninth grade with a general orientation to a cluster of jobs in nursing, food service, laboratory work, and the therapies, and relates all academic instruction to health services. In its first year, only the ninth grade is operating, but the plan is to move in stages towards specialization in one career area by the twelfth grade. Negotiations are under way to secure part-time, paid work stations for the students. The expectation is that upon graduation all will be eligible for immediate employment and that some will be sufficiently motivated to seek further education in junior-college or college programs.

Other programs are attempting to open up the deadend jobs in nursing through new uses of educational facilities. Under a new agreement between District 37 of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees and the New York City Department of Hospitals, an experimental program to upgrade nurses' aides to practical nurse status is being developed. The project will permit aides to continue to work part-time while they prepare for promotion. Training will be provided under New York City Board of Education auspices. The Hospital for Joint Diseases in New York City is experimenting with the upgrading of licensed practical nurses who, after six months' experience and 15 months of training, will become registered nurses. The aim is to demonstrate the basic continuity of nursing education when learning takes place in a health-service environment.

Academic education has values that go well beyond the scope of employment preparation. But when education becomes a condition of hiring, it is appropriate to measure its impact on career development. If we accept change in service and the consequent changes in manpower needs, then education must also change in form and content, in response, to the extent that it accepts a major role in the preparation of personnel. And one could make a case for a leadership role for educational institutions because of the lead time required to develop the facilities as well as the workers.

In nursing, we see a situation in which the profession has been willing to change in response to changing conditions, but has not recognized that traditional forms of education may be inapplicable to the changed conditions. There is no gainsaying that nurses, and all others, should have the opportunity to attain college or postgraduate degrees if they so desire. The issue is only whether these should be made mandatory employment requirements. This issue should be of concern to educators. It is the responsibility of education not to let itself be cast in an outmoded or inappropriate role by simply yielding to the professions or potential employers. Educational institutions can take the lead in determining their relationship to occupations and careers.

THE COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM MODEL

In the past year, attention has focused on the subprofessional jobs created under the auspices of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1965. Estimates differ, extending upwards to 150,000, with some 50,000 alone developed by Community Action agencies. This variation may reflect the extent to which part-time, summer jobs, and jobs other than subprofessional are included. Whatever the number, more subprofessional jobs have probably been created under Community Action Program auspices than ever before in any single year. Employment of the poor in programs under Office of Economic Opportunity sponsorship has become one of the significant ways of interpreting the mandate to develop, conduct, and administer programs with the maximum feasible participation of the poor.

Employment of the poor in programs designed to attack the causes of poverty has two facets -- to change the nature and delivery of services, making them more responsive to the needs of the poor, and to open new career opportunities for the unemployed or underemployed. Studies of the impact of Community Action Programs on the nature of the services provided to the poor have been and are continuing to be made. Their findings, generally based on single programs or groups of programs in one area, are neither consistent nor conclusive. There is general agreement that the involvement of the poor through Federally-funded programs has stimulated increased interaction between the neighborhoods and the local institutions, but as yet few observers detect any major changes in the permanent institutions themselves that can be attributed directly to this activity. For example, some evaluations of Head Start programs, in which approximately half of the subprofessionals in Community Action Programs were employed, report that although children may benefit from pre-school experience, the gains made are soon matched by their counterparts without this special program experience. One possible implication is that gains under Head Start programs are not sustained unless the character and quality of elementary school education is also changed. Studies of the impact of anti-poverty programs on the clients served, generally do not assess the particular impact derived from the employment of subprofessionals.

The manpower implications of subprofessional employment in the Community Action Programs are the subject of two recent independent evaluations, one by Daniel Yankelovich, Inc.,[1] and the second by the National Committee on Employment of Youth. The two studies surveyed subprofessionals in 14 cities, accounting for roughly 10 percent of the current subprofessional employment under CAP auspices. Both described and analyzed the functions performed, the hiring process, the training, supervision, and evaluation of subprofessionals. The major findings from this analysis in both studies are in considerable agreement. From the basis of these findings, the Yankelovich study developed recommendations for improved administration, hiring, and training of subprofessionals within Community Action Programs. While these recommendations are important to program administrators, they are of less direct concern to conference participants.

---

[1] Daniel Yankelovich, Inc. A Study of the Nonprofessional in the CAP. Prepared for Office of Economic Opportunity, September, 1966. (mimeo.)

In September, 1966, NCEY completed a one-year study of subprofessionals employed in Community Action agencies in four cities.[1] The study consisted of two phases: the hiring and training process, and the characteristics of those employed; and the degree to which jobs were likely to lead to permanent new careers in the more traditional employing institutions. The NCEY study devoted its second phase to exploring the possibilities for institutionalizing the roles developed in CAP's in permanent jobs with the more traditional employing institutions and agencies in the human services. The findings of this phase of the study are relevant to the conference.

The methodology in both phases combined informal discussions, interviews, and structured questionnaires. In all, structured questionnaires were administered to 154 subprofessionals and 111 of their immediate supervisors. This material was supplemented by informal discussions with program administrators and by observation of aides at work in training. In 13 CAP projects reviewed, the 17 job titles listed represented two broad categories -- subprofessional employment in school programs and in neighborhood centers.

The Subprofessional Jobs

The principal finding was that despite varying titles, there was a considerable degree of consistency in the stated job descriptions for similar programs. Official job designs were almost invariably at an entry level calculated to provide immediate employment for untrained workers. The teacher aides' primary duties were housekeeping and physical child care. Neighborhood workers were mainly area canvassers or information and referral workers. In the vast majority, only one job level was provided, an entry level at an annual wage rate slightly over the poverty line of $3,000 annually. In some programs all subprofessional jobs were designed to be part-time to "spread" the available work. Only one of the 13 programs reviewed provided for more than one subprofessional level of work with corresponding wage gradations.

Notwithstanding the one-level job design, actual functions of individual aides in each program displayed considerable variation. The jobs were defined only in terms of broad guidelines subject to interpretation by individual supervisors. For example, some teacher aides worked exclusively in housekeeping chores, while at the other end of the range some functioned almost interchangeably with teachers in planning activities or providing responsible and direct assistance to children. Some neighborhood workers served only as area canvassers, distributing printed information publicizing the neighborhood center, while others were negotiating with a wide range of permanent institutions on behalf of individual clients.

---

[1] National Committee on Employment of Youth. CAP Aide Study. Judith G. Benjamin, Edith F. Lynton *et al*. A study in four sections dated December, 1965, April, June, and September 1966. The cities studied were Rochester, N.Y., Baltimore, Md., Philadelphia, Pa., and Boston, Mass.

By and large, the majority of subprofessionals employed were functioning in roles not unlike those traditionally performed by volunteers in the schools and in social agencies. Only one program reviewed was experimenting with an entirely new role for subprofessionals. This was the Work-Education Training Center in Rochester, N.Y., where pre-school aides were used in lieu of a classroom teacher, thus providing an innovative role for the subprofessional and completely redesigning the teacher's role.

The lack of upgrading opportunities for the subprofessional within the programs themselves was recognized by many administrators as a major deficiency. This lack is, in part, attributable to the crash basis under which programs were operated and their uncertain tenure. Many administrators, at the time of the termination of NCEY's study, were considering ways in which to provide promotion opportunities or, at least, wage increments. It was significant, however, that the one program that planned in advance for a continuum of both subprofessional and professional jobs had already promoted most subprofessionals employed to a second level and had made work-study arrangements with a local training institution to facilitate staff development.

Through an intensive analysis of the variations in individual functioning, NCEY staff developed a three-level design for subprofessionals in both types of programs. This continuum spanned a range beginning at an entry level of routine and simple tasks, progressing to a middle range of direct service to clients, and reaching a semiprofessional stage of widened responsibility and scope. Such a range was found to exist without prior planning or differentiation in almost every program. The differences in individual functions were dependent on the subprofessional's capacity or the supervisor's interpretation. It was NCEY's view that this is one potential model that could be standardized and planned for with the expectation that, through training, most of those employed could attain at least the second level. A few neighborhood centers were beginning to create a series of specialties -- housing, employment, financial asstance, education -- suggesting the possibility of upgrading through specialization.

The Hiring Process

In the majority of programs, recruitment followed traditional patterns of reliance on established personal contacts or on publicity in the printed or mass media forms. This was true for programs operating independently or collaborating with outside institutions, for those under civil service auspices, and for those operated by elected representatives of the poor, as well. In general, those recruited responded to information disseminated by the program through a process of self-selection, applying for jobs in accordance with their understanding or interest in the program.

The focus in most programs was on selection rather than on recruitment. Here, the principal innovations consisted of limiting employment to the poor or to area residents and of waiving or lowering standard educational requirements. Few programs required anything more than minimal literacy or 8th-grade or equivalent education. Selection methods and criteria, however, often established by teachers or social workers, tended to nullify the lowered requirements through emphasis on verbal or attitudinal factors ascertained in tests or interviews. Even when screening was the province of subprofessional interviewers, traditional standards were maintained. In the words of one subprofessional screening teacher-aide candidates, "We look for all the good qualities we seek in a teacher."

The problems identified in selection were two-fold. First, the criteria themselves were not clearly defined. They were often no more than "the ability to work with children," or "the ability to relate to people." Second, programs were unable to develop appropriate methods for determining these qualities. As a result, they tended to rely on traditional criteria of education or prior relevant experience.

The majority employed in programs reviewed were high-school graduates, adult married women with considerable prior relevant experience, mainly volunteer, and not the hard-core poor. They were also, in the majority, Negro. The racial composition was largely a reflection of the population of program target areas. Oscar Ornati, in a review of subprofessionals in Community Action agencies, found they do not significantly differ in socio-demographic composition from the total labor force, except as to race.

The preponderance of female applicants for subprofessional jobs, a source of disappointment to many program administrators, has been interpreted variously. Some saw it as symptomatic of the character of the poverty population, in which women are the better-educated and the less-alienated, while others attributed it to the "image" of human-service work as women's work. A few recognized that the characteristics of applicants may have been at least partially determined by the job offered. Part-time or temporary work is more suited to the needs of wife and mother than to the career seeker or household head. To reach more men, and especially the hard core, many recognize, would require basic changes in recruitment and selection procedures, higher wages, and substantial increments in training.

Wages were considered to be a factor in the low rate of male employment among the programs. Earnings, however, were not necessarily the only factor. If more men were to be attracted to subprofessional jobs, some administrators said, more thought would have to be given to different avenues and techniques of recruiting, and to training opportunities for advancement. The men employed frequently stated that although wages were low, they were less concerned with the entry rates than with the future opportunities.

Education was a central issue in almost all programs. The major difference between anti-poverty hiring practices for subprofessionals and the practices of other employers was the lowering or absence of educational requirements. Why then were the majority employed high-school graduates, and why were there so many with post-high-school education? In the opinion of several program administrators, the high percentage of high-school graduates among applicants reflects the difficulties many, especially in minority groups, face in finding work, or work of interest to them. It was probably also true that the better educated were more likely to learn about such opportunities for employment and to consider themselves possible applicants for work connected with the professions. Better educated applicants are also less likely to be screened out by tests or interviews that emphasize literacy or verbal skills.

The essential problem may be that the precise level of educational attainment necessary for effective performance in the subprofessional role is not clear. Program administrators seldom expressed a preference for the better-educated. Indeed, some were convinced that educational attainment does not generally correlate with ability to function on the job. Although educational criteria may be irrelevant, alternate and more appropriate criteria remain to be developed.

Training and Supervision

The lack of training facilities in Community Action Programs was a generally recognized deficiency. Few programs had training funds or facilities available to them for the first year of their existence.[1] Much of the planning for a second-year activity was focused on proposals for training not only the subprofessionals but the professionals as well. Many were contracting with outside facilities, frequently junior colleges, to supplement training needs. During the first year of operation, training was almost entirely on-the-job and the responsibility of the immediate supervisors, who were seldom chosen for their experience or ability as trainers. The relative merits of different training settings and methods remain to be tested. The use of existing educational institutions versus specially designed training agencies is one unanswered question. Another is whether each job title requires a separate training facility or whether a core concept is appropriate for a wider range of occupations. A third question is the extent to which training is best provided on the job.

The NCEY staff view was that the development of appropriate training cannot be considered an independent question. The lack of standardized functions, the lack of a distinct role for the subprofessional and planned upgrading sequences, limits the ability of training institutions to devise appropriate curricula. Until subprofessional jobs are designed as independent entities and not merely as appendages to the professional, it will be difficult to determine with any precision the abilities and skills required by the job.

---

[1] The Yankelovich report focused on the training needs of programs and recommended that the experienced subprofessionals be upgraded to assistant trainers of the newly hired.

Some skill needs were discovered by the study. The principal inadequacies of subprofessional performance reported to NCEY staff by program supervisors occurred in connection with written materials, interviewing, and recording, deficiencies which probably could be corrected by training. But the training needs of direct-service functions are likely to remain unclear until these functions are more clearly and consistently determined.

Evaluation of Subprofessional Performance

Objective performance standards were seldom established.[1] Such evaluation as existed was based on the opinions of administrators, supervisors, and some independent observers, the majority of whom reported that the subprofessionals functioned well, frequently above anticipated levels. The consensus was that competence was not necessarily a factor of specific levels of formal education or prior relevant experience. Nor was economic status a precise determinant. The poor have been found to vary in attitudes, goals, and in their suitability for subprofessional tasks. Not all the poor, not even all local leaders with considerable experience in organizational activity, communicate easily and effectively. Planners have become aware of the need for more relevant selection criteria and for a flexible job design that will allow differential assignments.

The concern with evaluation was beginning to extend to the professional role. Several administrators discussed the need for training professionals to work with subprofessionals. The original concern on the part of many had been with the possibility of friction between professionals and subprofessionals. This proved to be minimal. The two groups, on the whole, worked well together with considerable rapport, engendered, perhaps, by mutual commitment to anti-poverty goals. Subprofessionals, in general, recognized the value of professional skill. Administrators noted the need for higher levels of professional competence including the ability to supervise and train aides and serve as consultants to subprofessionals. There were some who questioned whether standard professional education alone automatically equipped the professional for the modified and enlarged role.

Permanent Subprofessional Jobs

The second phase of the NCEY study focused on the possibilities for institutionalizing the subprofessional jobs developed in Community Action Programs. To determine this, informal interviews were held with top executives and personnel officers of a variety of institutions in each of the four communities. These included schools, hospitals, public and voluntary social agencies, housing, health, and recreation departments. Representatives from professional associations, unions, training institutions, coordinating and regulatory bodies, such as civil service, also were consulted. Leaders of important citizens' groups, employment service staff, and labor market analysts were interviewed as well to learn their over-all opinion of current and future prospects. On the average there were about 25 such consultations in each city.

---

[1] The Yankelovich report notes that subprofessionals were seldom discharged. All were generally retained irrespective of performance.

In all cases, two basic questions were asked: What current permanent opportunities are available to subprofessionals now employed in Federally-funded programs? What are the potentials for subprofessional employment in the future? The opinions were not gathered on a statistical basis as a representative sample of total opinion, but rather as an indication of the range of problems and potential existing in the four communities. Although discussion was focused on the local scene, the issues were similar in nature in all four cities and probably common to urban areas and to public and non-profit employment. The concern was less with the details of local practice than with the manpower needs and the difficulties in their fulfillment generic to schools, social agencies, hospitals, and other institutions likely to employ subprofessionals.

From the interviews conducted in all four communities, it was apparent that the jobs currently available were few in number and scattered throughout institutions in no systematic or standardized form. Subprofessional jobs for which those then employed in Community Action Programs could qualify were limited to demonstration projects or other programs under Federal or special support. Apart from special programs, opportunities were frequently part-time, volunteer, or open only to those with at least a high-school diploma and, in many cases, with some years of college. Most subprofessional jobs were low-paying, low-level, with few connections within the organizational structure permitting progression to higher pay or greater responsibility.

Most of those interviewed, however, were able to envision considerable future potential for the employment of subprofessionals. But the basic problem of job creation appeared to have at least two important aspects -- first, establishing new jobs at an entry level and second, integrating these new roles into an occupational structure. Many administrators were able to suggest entry-level roles, but only a few saw the possibility of some aspect of career development if an apprenticeship or a junior college program were provided. Most could not envision bridging the essential discontinuity of the occupational ladder in helping services.

Although some recognized that, as one administrator said, "the professional must have some help or face violent job dilution," for the most part, they were unable to delineate roles other than low-level jobs without significant career potential. Translating even such suggestions into action is impeded by a wide range of obstacles considered to inhere in public and non-profit operations.

The obstacles discussed by those interviewed included budgetary restrictions, political controls, limitations within the structure of the organization, as well as attitudes in the underlying philosophies of the professions. In quantitative terms, discussion of obstacles far outweighed all other topics.

Of the obstacles discussed, financial problems were preeminent. Some administrators of public agencies doubted that total budgets derived from local sources could be expanded, especially in view of the financial plight of the large cities. It was their view that communities are often more receptive to increased capital spending than to increased allocations for personnel. As a result, they considered that their ability to add new levels of staff depended largely on Federal funds. Some were, however, concerned with an overdependence on Federal money.

In addition to limited total financial budgets, the established budget lines further restrict action. The low salary levels for human-service workers already employed were considered an urgent immediate problem facing most administrators. To some, the whole issue of job creation appeared unrealistic in the face of mounting pressure for wage increases by all categories of staff. Many pointed to the low salaries for professionals in human-service fields as a fundamental reason why subprofessional jobs could only be created at marginal wages. Whether or not low wages are the entire reason, most agencies are understaffed and, therefore, lack sufficient professionals to supervise and train new subprofessionals.

Financial problems of public agencies are further complicated by the connections between salaries and credentials. Most pay scales are determined by educational credits or length of service so that there is constant pressure to raise minimum levels to protect those already employed and provide the basis for wider ranges of increments and higher rates of pay. As one administrator said, "All public welfare departments are oriented towards upgrading professional requirements as a part of the push for higher salaries." The financial premium placed on education, increasingly true of all occupations, but explicit in civil service and the merit systems of large bureaucracies, runs counter to the need for lowering or eliminating education requirements to allow for subprofessional employment.

According to the common view, systems of job classification are slow to move and hard to change. Revising classifications poses immense procedural problems which were largely untouched by Community Action Programs. Some were independent hiring agents free from outside controls. Those in which subprofessionals were hired under Civil Service or school personnel classifications generally circumvented the classification needs by establishing temporary, non-classified posts or by using available, albeit inappropriate, titles. For example, some subprofessionals in the school programs were classified as laborers, the only category open without competitive examinations, some as clerical workers, and others under temporary titles with no tenure or access to other job categories. Administrators of permanent agencies recognized that such expedients, while practical perhaps for special and temporary programs, cannot serve for permanent job titles.

Financial and technical problems are to some extent compounded by resistance of the professional to the subprofessional. The nature and magnitude of this resistance, most found, was difficult to assess. The general view was that professional resistance, although a factor to be reckoned with, would not be a major or insurmountable obstacle. Some thought such resistance would dissipate if money were available for both new careers and salary increases in established occupations. Most were of the opinion that problems of this nature would be minimal if the functions and status of subprofessionals and professionals were carefully differentiated.

Some believe that philosophical stances of the professions, manifest in existing organizational structure and the patterns of service delivery, will demand attention. The division between instructional and noninstructional functions in educational theory and personnel practices, the issue of confidentiality associated with all professions, the traditional social-work goals of objectivity and non-involvement with the client, are examples of conceptual issues that to some extent may require modification to permit the subprofessional to function in direct-service work.

Whether new roles for subprofessionals can be institutionalized was considered debatable by many of those interviewed, to some of whom the financial and structural barriers appeared virtually insuperable. Although the majority viewpoint was that no one agency or local division has sufficient power to effect the necessary changes, some attitudes were more optimistic about producing change by means of specific actions.

Most suggestions, not altogether unexpectedly, concerned training. Employers in all fields, including industry, commerce, and the commercial services, are quick to suggest that education or training is the key to employment. Some human-service employers suggested that there is a question as to which should come first, the job or the training. But the majority appeared to feel that if trained workers were available they would be hired. To them, outside institutions, the schools, and the junior colleges are the prime source of trained subprofessional manpower. The junior colleges were frequently cited as the best training facility because many equate the subprofessional with the technician in work level. The special attribute of junior colleges is their ability to offer subject matter and focus on techniques, in contrast with the disinclination of regular academic institutions to emphasize the "applied" uses of their disciplines. Junior-college programs were deemed superior to special programs or in-service training because they provide an associate degree or other certification upon completion of a course, credentials more acceptable in formally classified employment structures.

A few saw a need for new forms of training coupled with new forms of accreditation because they regarded dependence on pre-service formal training as likely to continue to limit manpower resources. Moreover, they were of the opinion that the total content of degree-oriented programs is not necessary or relevant for all workers or all subprofessional jobs. Experience in entry levels designed to serve as training stations or apprenticeships is preferable, they said, because it opens the doors to a wider range of candidates and provides a mutual opportunity for employer and employee to test the suitability of subprofessional work. They were aware, however, that effective on-the-job training and experience requires a unified and systematic approach to job design by groups of agencies, and the provision of a mechanism by which such experience and training can be accredited. They suggested that, while a full two-year college program may not be necessary for all, some inputs of formal training may be required, probably best offered in combination with work.

The majority view has as its basis the traditional merit system approach of hiring based on specified credentials. The aim is to provide subprofessionals with a new set of credentials that might be accepted, a goal some see as attainable, but not without difficulty. Most considered individual agencies or local divisions of state or national institutions as incapable of modifying existing job requirements. The minority view, on the other hand, appeared to be that unless agencies free themselves to some extent from the credentials bind, they will be unable to make maximum use of subprofessionals. Despite these differences, there appeared to be a consensus that, whatever the approach, the development of something more than entry jobs for subprofessionals will probably require a multidisciplinary effort.

On balance, the program administrators and the employers in permanent human services seem to be arriving at a similar conclusion -- that rational use of this potential manpower resource depends on the development of permanent subprofessional careers. Anti-poverty staffs recognize that the test of gains made in developing new manpower in programs is whether there are matching gains in permanent employment. They are concerned that the benefits derived by subprofessionals from work in direct-service functions, and the commitment to such work, will be lost if those employed cannot find secure and meaningful job opportunities outside the temporary programs. The subprofessionals themselves sense the problem. As one said, "This job, and all that it is, is all by itself."

The impact of anti-poverty programs on the traditional employing institutions has, thus far, been mainly ideological. The idea of the subprofessional has been gaining adherents. However, the permanent employers are critical of the anti-poverty program's inability or unwillingness to create subprofessional models that relate to service-manpower needs as the permanent employers see those needs. They feel that the anti-poverty designs are neither sufficiently innovative nor are they productive of workers who function at high enough levels of performance. There are also unresolved questions as to the pertinence of such anti-poverty considerations as the social and political objectives of community involvement.

So long as anti-poverty programs operate as separate entities without involving the permanent institutions, these questions may remain unresolved. Without a resolution of these questions, the potential of the anti-poverty programs as a testing ground for new subprofessional models useful to the permanent institutions will be severely restricted.

SELECTED MODELS OF SUBPROFESSIONAL CAREERS

In recent years important experimental and innovative approaches to subprofessional employment have been developed by a number of local programs under a variety of foundation and governmental sponsorship. The primary purposes of these programs have been to test the capacity for subprofessional performance of those persons generally considered unemployable, or at least incapable of human-service work, and to test the rehabilitative effect of such employment on the worker. To achieve their goals, the programs frequently have developed new jobs for their trainees or provided a new type of service to the community.

Among the better known programs of this type are: The New Careers Development Project in San Francisco, training inmates and ex-offenders to work in rehabilitative and preventative services; the Howard University Center for Youth and Community Studies, developing roles for problem youth in research, recreation, and community organization; and Mobilization for Youth, training indigenous persons for a wide range of community service roles, including social-service and health aides for local hospitals.

From such programs have come insights into the employment potential of the disadvantaged and increasing understanding of the applicability of training methods and materials. Moreover, these programs frequently were pioneers in testing the validity of the neighborhood center approach to human services. They saw this as a setting in which subprofessionals could serve as liaison between established services and the area residents, thereby reaching the often unreached.

At the outset, programs concentrated on aggressive recruitment of disadvantaged persons, including those with limited education and personal histories of anti-social behavior, and provided them with intensive training and supportive services to develop their ability to function adequately at an entry level. Now the objectives are broadening. Many programs are currently concerned with whether the subprofessional roles and the setting developed in the programs can be institutionalized _per se_ or incorporated within traditional service agencies. Toward this goal special programs are strengthening their connections with permanent institutions, broadening their training components in an effort to gain some measure of standard accreditation, and attempting to find permanent placements for subprofessionals developed by the program.

The problem of institutionalizing new subprofessional roles is extremely difficult. The ability of permanent institutions to absorb those without expected educational backgrounds, or with personal problems, is limited. As a result, some programs are instead attempting to develop career ladders within their own confines as models of subprofessional potential. New programs that build on these earlier experiments are being sponsored by Federal funds or by the service agencies themselves. Some are only in the proposal stage, but others are already beginning operation.

We have described briefly a few from the large number of such programs, to indicate the range of innovations that have some relevance to established human service fields. Those selected were chosen as examples of some of the possibilities for career planning for subprofessionals. Because so often subprofessional employment is synonomous with female employment, we have chosen some examples because they employ a high proportion of men. The descriptions that follow are either abstracts of full reports of the programs and interviews with program personnel by NCEY staff, or written statements specially prepared by the program staff for distribution to conference participants.

Subprofessionals in Health

The Neighborhood Health Center as a model of comprehensive care and outreach services is considered by many to be an important future mode of health service delivery. We have selected two programs to be described, one an OEO-funded health center, and the other a demonstration project providing mental-health services. In addition, we are sending a reprint from the American Journal of Public Health, discussing a demonstration program in the Public Health Service, and a specially prepared report of a proposal, funded as yet only in the research development phase, that delineates a health careers model combining the new types of community health service roles and the traditional hospital-based occupations.

The Neighborhood Medical Care Demonstration
Montefiore-Morrisania Hospital, Bronx, N.Y.

Of all the neighborhood health centers funded under OEO auspices, this program, according to OEO spokesmen, is the one most fully developed with respect to subprofessional employment. Funded as of July 1966, this center has been in operation since November 1966. The over-all purpose of the Montefiore-Morrisania center is to provide comprehensive and socially meaningful health care to the poor. The project serves a neighborhood where the vast majority has received medical care frequently lacking continuity, follow-up, or preventive medicine from clinics of the nearby hospitals. The approach of the center is a comprehensive, hospital-affiliated, and family-centered team practice. It aims to stimulate the community to improve its own health care. Furthermore, the project hopes to mitigate the self-perpetuating problems of the unemployed by employing neighborhood residents in the provision of health services.

The program has two basic components. One is focused on the delivery of service, and organized around a health center located in the neighborhood and two smaller satellite centers. In these centers, comprehensive therapeutic and preventive ambulatory care is offered in medical and dental services, as well as social services to individuals, families, and the community at large. The center staffing pattern consists of teams composed of a physician, a public health nurse, and a subprofessional, the family health worker.

The family health workers, a new type of para-medical worker, are being trained and employed by the project itself. The role was created to fill a gap in home-medical care service and to combine many of the functions traditionally performed by public health nurses, nurses' aides, health educators, and social workers -- all in short supply. Based either in the main health center or satellite centers, the worker will spend most of his or her time making home visits to follow up the cases under center supervision. During the course of these visits, the family health worker will deal with social and environmental problems as they arise, provide direct medical care of a simple and routine nature, and educate families in some of the preventive aspects of health care and hygiene.

In addition to center services, the project offers a training program to prepare local residents for both traditional health careers and such new roles as family health worker or physician's assistant. Training is directed towards occupations in which permanent placement can be virtually assured, in both hospitals and other health agencies. All trainees receive first an eight-week core training program to acquaint them with the general nature of health services, basic health skills, and existing community resources, and to provide them with a survey of the possibilities in health careers. Remediation in language or mathematics is offered if needed. Following this general orientation, students move to the on-the-job training phase of the occupation of their choice. They are trained as family health workers, laboratory technicians, medical record assistants, obstetrical technicians, and inhalation therapists. The duration of the on-the-job phase is from three months to one year, depending on the type of job and the skills required. In general, they are trained by the agencies that will employ them, some by the hospital and others in the health center. In addition to family health workers, the center also trains clerical personnel, teacher assistants, or community workers.

Thus far there have been two core groups trained who now are continuing in the on-the-job phase of training in both the hospital and the centers. Training opportunities are open to all area residents between the ages of 18 and 55. Thus far training is offered only on a full-time basis, but the possibility of part-time training is being investigated. During the training period, trainees are paid a stipend of $55 a week for the first three months, and $60 a week thereafter. Indicative of the high interest in health careers among area residents is the fact that some 106 applied for the first 30 training openings. No educational requirements are made. Instead, applicants are tested for general aptitudes and selected by group and individual interviews. The qualities sought are potential for learning and acceptable attitudes, rather than any specific skills or experience.

A major aim of the training program has been to gain accreditation or certification by means of course credit for the core and on-the-job training sequences. According to project staff, hospital workers' unions have been cooperative in permitting those hired to enter the training opportunities in the hospitals for the on-the-job training phase. The problem of accreditation has been somewhat more difficult. Local colleges have been approached, but as yet none have been able to devise a satisfactory arrangement for accrediting the training offered under the project's auspices. The project is continuing to seek a mutually satisfactory relationship with an educational institution for this purpose.

Lateral and upward mobility is of major interest to the program staff. The possibilities for licensure or integration with more traditional employment for the role of family health worker are being explored. Possibilities for supervisory and training positions for family health workers are open, some of whom, it is anticipated, eventually will be employed by hospital home-care programs. Upgrading those trained for the more traditional occupations depends on the extent to which accreditation for their training can be secured as a basis for higher levels of technical work.

The ultimate aim of the project is to become self-supporting and to be a model that can be replicated elsewhere. One of its principal objectives is to involve neighborhood residents in the organization, policy-planning, operation, and provision of service. To this end, the subprofessional component of staff is particularly important. By means of ongoing evaluation and assessment of the project's impact on the community, the staff expects to be able to establish the strengths and weaknesses to help the program meet its ultimate goals.

The Lincoln Hospital Mental Health Services
Department of Psychiatry, Yeshiva University

The Neighborhood Service Center Program, initiated in January 1965, is a demonstration to test the feasibility of developing a Neighborhood Mental Health Center, a type of psycho-social first-aid station, staffed primarily by subprofessionals drawn from the area. Without any historical precedents for either the pattern of service delivery, the setting, or the subprofessional roles, the program has evolved gradually and been modified continuously. But the center has always revolved primarily around the subprofessional.

There are, at present, 30 mental-health aides employed in three store-front, walk-in centers. The center aides provide information and referral services to clients on a wide range of individual, family, and social problems. They also offer direct service and help with making appointments, filling out forms, and expediting client requests. All work full-time and at the entry level are paid $4,680 annually. Of those employed, about 40 percent are men. This higher proportion of men than is usually found in most subprofessional programs reflects a recruiting policy's focus.

Initially, recruiting was an important and demanding activity. It was difficult to attract residents to a new job and a new field of work. But as the program has become entrenched in the neighborhood, applicants have outnumbered the available openings. The hiring process now concentrates instead on selection. The selection policy avoids the use of arbitrary or external credentials. The key element is a group-screening process during which applicants are observed by a panel of experts. The process serves the double purposes of screening and orientation.

Because staffing of centers revolves around the subprofessionals, training has been intensive and continuous. It focused, at first, on the two basic skills deemed immediately essential, interviewing and expediting. Later, the role of the aide expanded into some aspects of counseling and community organization, and training, accordingly, expanded. All training has been work-oriented, without regard for existing disciplinary lines within the mental health field.

This program, now completing a second year, considers the subprofessional in a neighborhood center a sound and viable concept. The possibilities for providing permanent jobs for subprofessionals are limited because the centers are not part of any permanent institutional setting. They could conceivably become a part of comprehensive mental health centers when such centers become a reality. The extent to which the hiring policies utilized by the demonstration project and a staffing pattern composed of a high proportion of subprofessionals is likely to become a feature of permanent centers is undetermined. Another alternative, to incorporate the center within existing hospital structures, would entail considerable negotiation with personnel officers, civil service, and unions to waive or modify the standard requirements when hiring subprofessionals.

Thus, prospects for institutionalizing these roles are as yet uncertain. The current status as a demonstration project, however, permits a flexible and experimental approach. Because of the difficulties of moving to a permanent status, the project now is proposing to establish two new job levels to allow for upgrading of those employed. Upgrading, until now, has been limited to financial recognition of increased competence and experience, providing annual increments of $300, up to a salary level of $5,280 at the end of two years' service. For the future, the project proposes to establish two new job levels -- a senior mental-health aide worker, to be paid $5,780, and a supervisory-level worker at $6,380. The senior level would serve as an automatic promotion after three years of service, but could become available, in shorter periods, to the unusually able subprofessional. Four supervisory jobs will be established to serve as promotions solely on the basis of merit, without reference to length of service. The goal is to provide for upgrading to a supervisory level, open without requirements or credentials beyond the experience and in-service training the program itself affords. A further upgrading level is being considered, but this fourth level, probably semiprofessional or junior professional, may demand some formal education.

The ultimate goal of the project from the point of view of career development is to establish and test an occupational sequence permitting the untrained entry worker to achieve full professional status by accrediting his experience, which will be supplemented with formal training on a work-study basis only as he approaches full professional status. There is a commitment to allow development to a supervisory level without any outside training requirements. The focus continues to be on the subprofessional as a principal service agent.

Subprofessionals in the Schools

Although examples abound of programs employing subprofessionals as teacher aides, few can be found that serve as models of careers. The role of auxiliaries in the schools has become an accepted one, but, as pointed out in earlier papers, there has been greater interest to date in the effect on the children of the use of additional adults in the classroom than in the employment opportunities the subprofessional jobs provide. One of the most comprehensive studies of auxiliary personnel in schools is being conducted by the Bank Street College of Education. The findings of the 1966 study which focused on preparing teachers to work with the disadvantaged have been published.[1] The current study, to be completed in 1967, concentrates on the auxiliary personnel, the roles, training, and institutionalization. Findings are based on observations of 15 demonstration programs.

An interim report, released in March 1967, discusses the rationale for using auxiliary personnel as perceived in the past year-and-a-half experience by program administrators. The general view is that even if there were no shortage of teachers, the introduction in the classroom of more adults, selected on the basis of their concern for children and potential as supportive personnel rather than primarily on the basis of previous training, is a positive benefit to the school system. Great possibilities were seen for the multi-level team method as an escape from the rigid structuring of the classroom and as a potential for more individualized attention, smaller groupings, independent activity, all of which free the teacher for innovative and creative techniques and approaches. Bank Street believes that such advantages would obtain in any classroom regardless of school population or socioeconomic background of the children. The multiple benefits perceived include providing meaningful employment for the auxiliaries themselves as well as aiding them in the performance of their parental roles.

In addition, the report noted specific benefits from utilizing indigenous personnel who provide a role model and a cultural bridge to children and families in schools serving the disadvantaged. Although not all the poor can work effectively in this setting, programs have revealed among them a potential resource, overlooked so far. In the opinion of the Bank Street group, real significance of the auxiliary role is only now beginning to be explored.

From observances thus far, the Bank Street report offers recommendations in regard to role development[2] and training of auxiliaries. The auxiliaries' role must be clearly defined to prevent "their underutilization by unconvinced professionals or their overutilization by harried administrators faced by manpower shortages."[1] Role definition requires an analysis of the reciprocal relationship between the professionals and the auxiliaries which will entail a reexamination of teaching functions to identify the appropriate auxiliary areas, such as monitoring, technical services, clerical work, and the "more important functions directly related to instruction and to home-school relations."[2] Teaching functions must be studied in order to select those that should be performed by teachers alone.

---

[1] Gordon J. Klopf and Garda W. Bowman. Teacher Education in a Social Context. Prepared for Bank Street College of Education by Mental Health Materials Center, Inc. New York City, July 1966.

[2] A subsequent Bank Street report, entitled New Partners in the Educational Enterprise, released July 1967, notes that a salient outcome of the introduction of auxiliary personnel in a school system was the need to rethink all roles and relationships. See, for example, pp. 61 and ff.

The recommendation concerning the need to identify an auxiliary role is extremely significant to the planning of subprofessional careers. Frequently, educational program administrators, teachers' associations, and other groups suggest that the individual teacher, not the school, should delineate the subprofessional role. Implicit in the Bank Street view is the need to come to grips with the question of what precisely are the instructional functions that must be performed by certified teachers. The outcome of such examination may require new legislation or new and consistent interpretations of existing regulations.

Training recommendations focus on the need for pre-service training of all categories of staff, including administrators and teachers. Joint sessions are needed to develop a sound approach to collaborative education and to permit teachers and auxiliaries to try out and evaluate their team-work under the close supervision of training staff. In addition, the trainers and supervisors must be trained. In-service and continued training should be integrated with long-term, stable, and open-ended employment. The cooperation of community and two-year colleges and teacher-education institutions should be sought to develop appropriate curriculum to provide opportunities for the advancement of subprofessionals and to introduce into teacher training the concept of team work.

Program administrators recognize the importance of institutionalizing the auxiliary role and believe that training for jobs that are temporary or deadended will be frustrating. Although the question of institutionalization is mainly a future one, according to the Bank Street study, it offers some broad guidelines, which will probably be revised and strengthened during the second phase of the current study. The guidelines suggest:

> ...That when and if a school system decides to utilize auxiliary personnel, the program be incorporated as an integral part of the school system, not treated as an extraneous adjunct to the system
>
> ...That goals be thought through carefully, stated clearly, and implemented by means of definite procedures
>
> ...That there be cooperative planning by the school systems, local institutions of higher learning, and the indigenous leadership of the community served by the schools, both before the program has been inaugurated and after it has been institutionalized

---

[1] Garda W. Bowman and Gordon J. Klopf. Auxiliary School Personnel: Their Roles, Training, and Institutionalization, Bank Street College of Education, New York City, p. 8.

[2] Ibid. p. 9.

...That each step on the career ladder be specified in terms of functions, salaries, increments, and role prerogatives, moving from routine functions at the entry level to functions which are more responsible and more directly related to the learning-teaching process

...That professional standards be preserved and that all tasks performed by teacher-aides be supervised by a teacher

...That encouragement of those who desire to train and qualify for advancement be expressed in such a way that others who prefer to remain at the entry level feel no lack of job satisfaction, status, and recognition of the worth of their services--in other words, that there should be opportunity but not compulsion for upward mobility

...That time be scheduled during the school day or after school hours with extra compensation for teachers and auxiliaries and other professional-nonprofessional teams to evaluate their experiences and plan together for the coming day

...That the quantity and quality of supervision be reexamined in the light of the needs of this program

...That the personal needs and concerns of both professionals and auxiliaries be dealt with in counseling sessions as they adjust to a new and sometimes threatening situation

...That parents be involved in the program both as auxiliaries and as recipients of the services of family workers

...That contacts be established with professional groups

...That a continuing program of interpretation among educators and to the broader community be developed, with emphasis upon feed-back as well as imparting information

...That an advisory committee of school administrators, supervisors, teachers, auxiliaries, parents, community leaders, and university consultants be established to evaluate and improve the utilization of auxiliaries in each school where such a program is undertaken [1]

Of all the programs included in the study, 13 are sponsored by educational institutions, mainly universities, and two are sponsored directly by school systems. Because the university component is to train and prepare auxiliaries for work in school programs, the individual profile of each demonstration concentrates on the methods and structure of training. The question of role definition is, as to be expected, only approached in the case of the two programs under school-system auspices.

The first discussion of this issue is contained in the report of the Detroit City School System pilot project. Detroit has employed auxiliary personnel for a few years, and, as recently as February 1966, incorporated a large number into the school system. Aware of the problems of developing suitable roles for new categories of personnel, the city instituted a project funded by OEO to explore job design and training requirements for both auxiliaries and teachers and to examine the changes needed in the institutional structures to make maximum effective use of auxiliaries. Accordingly, 40 teachers and 40 aides were prepared in a six-week institute, prior to their return to school as teaching teams. The auxiliaries chosen were either high-school graduates or their equivalent, with an indication of high potential or demonstrated competence in previous employment in the school system. In the course of the project, the staff identified two major questions concerned with the implementation of permanent jobs. The first question is whether, like dental or medical assistants, aides were to develop along clearly differentiated levels, separate from the professional, or whether their roles were to overlap spheres of accepted teacher authority. A subsidiary problem is whether the demarcation between auxiliary and professional should be a part of contractual agreement with the auxiliaries. The second question is how to contribute to better education for the children without weakening the status of teachers whose value to the community is always subject to review by the tax-conscious voter. Teachers and aides alike appear to share a concern with, and a desire for, clear lines of demarcation between the two roles.

---

[1] Ibid. pp. 11-12.

Of interest also is the report on the program of the Berkeley School District in California, employing both neighborhood workers and teacher aides. Noted here was the large and diverse number of activities and tasks proposed by the planners for neighborhood workers, in contrast with the relative hesitancy to designate functions and activities for teacher aides.

The New York University Training Program, which prepared 40 aides to work in the New York City public schools, found that the aides believed their training equipped them to function at a higher level than that of the standard New York City school-aide job. They felt prepared to assist the teacher in a variety of ways, including the performance of tasks directly related to the educational process. The program encouraged the aides to develop strategies to enable them to communicate to the Board of Education a need for reexamination of a policy that limits the auxiliary functions to monitorial and clerical.

Almost all the programs described in the Bank Street report employ aides in the usual capacity of direct one-to-one assistants to individual teachers. In all programs, subprofessionals were predominantly adult women. The requirements varied. Some programs demanded high-school diplomas; others followed an open-hiring policy; still others permitted those employed to acquire high-school equivalency as part of the training.

The report indicates that as yet no more than a one-level subprofessional job design has been formulated. The struggle is still to define just that one level. The Bank Street study questions whether the approach toward career planning should not be made in concert with planning the entry job even if other levels would not be filled until some future time.

High School Training for New Careers in Human Services

Institute for Youth Studies, Howard University

Of the 15 projects, the one sponsored by the Institute for Youth Studies of Howard University, in Washington, D.C., is unique. Essentially the new careers approach, it offers a work-study program for high-school seniors as preparation for human-service occupations. The project employs the hard-to-reach and most difficult youth and aims to hold them in school by offering them paid work experience toward subprofessional jobs, jobs likely to exist at the time of graduation. This is the only project of those reviewed by Bank Street in which males predominated. Two-thirds of those hired were high-risk candidates, because of their backgrounds of personal difficulties and poor school achievement.

The program provides on-the-job experience for teacher aides in the Model School Division and for home-health aides working as assistants in the Public Health Nursing Department, in Washington, D.C. The academic content is tailored to the work and includes a modified high-school curriculum, special skills training, and remedial work with emphasis on oral skills. In addition, a core group experience permits all the students to become involved in the planning and evaluation of their training.

Of the group to graduate in June this year, all are placed -- 19 as teacher aides in the elementary-school system and nine as health aides in the local health department, all at salaries of $3,900 a year. The placement is evidence of the university's overriding concern with making the preparation, at the very least, a stepping stone to an entry job. The ability to place the hard-core youth is important as a measure of the rehabilitation and motivation developed in the program over and above the commitment to the particular vocational goals. According to Howard University staff, the career possibilities stand only at the threshold. Their efforts have been mainly to secure entry jobs for these youth and to assure that those entry jobs were real. It is clear that developing a career sequence out of these entry jobs will require considerable revamping of the whole personnel structure of the agencies and institutions in which the new graduates are employed.

> From the beginning of the program a major task of job development has been geared to reaching agreements with school and health agencies on the following: (1) a stated definition of a viable job to which training can be geared; (2) formal commitments by the agency to employ the trainee at a specific grade and salary for at least one year following graduation; (3) development of a job classification system to ensure lateral and vertical occupational mobility of the aides in accordance with their capacities and abilities.[1]

The training intent of the program differed sharply from that in the other demonstrations, in that it was not designed solely to prepare participants to function in a teacher-auxiliary partnership. It pursued the parallel roles of training the enrollees as aides and of providing a high-school experience leading to a diploma. With respect to institutionalization, the concept of having the aides' program part of a high-school curriculum may result, according to the Bank Street group, in imaginative new ideas about the utilization of aides.

---

[1] Institute for Youth Studies, Howard University. High School Training for New Careers in Human Services. An interim report. March, 1967.

The Work-Education Training Centers, Rochester, N.Y.
A New Role for the Subprofessional in the Education Process

The Work-Education and Training Centers in Rochester, now in their second year, are pre-school programs conducted by the Rochester Public School System, Department of Early Childhood Education, as a demonstration, and financed under Title II of the Economic Opportunity Act on a year-to-year basis. The centers offer pre-school services to children of poor families, with priority given to those who have emotional problems or come from multi-problem families.

The manpower objectives are twofold: to test the rehabilitative effect of employment in a subprofessional capacity for those normally considered unemployable in such work, and to test the feasibility of using subprofessionals in a distinctly new role within the educational process.

The subprofessionals in this project are not teacher aides in the usual sense. They are not assigned as helpers to an individual teacher. Instead, in teams of two, subprofessionals take charge of a classroom. The professional teacher functions as consultant and trainer, coming into the classroom regularly to observe and evaluate, or at the request of the subprofessional. The aides plan the daily activities, implement their plans, and maintain discipline. Although there is no formal instruction in an academic sense in the pre-school program, such teaching functions as demonstrating arts and crafts and music and games, among others, are performed by the subprofessionals. It is noteworthy that not only is the subprofessional role amplified, but the professional, or teacher's, role is radically redefined.

Reliance is placed on intensive pre-service and in-service training and supervision. The pre-service training is designed to provide actual experience in a laboratory setting. It starts with guided observation, and the initial focus is both limited and specific. All trainees are given the opportunity to try working directly in the observed situation. Generally, in the beginning, the new aides function in one task with one child. The primary element in the training method is the group process, consisting of daily sessions, at first led by professionals and later by the subprofessionals themselves.

The key to success in this program, according to staff, is the professional teacher. Teachers are selected not for their teaching experience, but for their ability to learn and to respond innovatively, and to accept an altogether new role. The essence of the program is a major revision of the traditional role of the teacher. Only those who can view this change as worth testing, without strong prejudgments concerning either the professional role or disadvantaged people, are employed. Because the standard professional attitudes were regarded as a major potential problem, training of teachers has been emphasized. They have been assigned to scrutinize the subprofessionals' efforts and search out those qualities that equip the subprofessional for the job.

The focus in hiring subprofessionals is on recruiting, not selection. Those who would not be hired, or are not likely to apply for the standard and less-demanding teacher-aides' jobs in regular school systems, are those who are sought by WETC. And many who were hired had been turned down for jobs in Head Start programs. To reach the unreachable, the program actively sought out problem people in the target neighborhoods. Some were referred by social agencies, others by the State Employment Service. SES personnel were instructed to refer to the project those registering for domestic service or other menial work, and not to restrict referral to those who applied for teaching-aide jobs. According to staff, they were looking for "a lack of appropriate qualifications." Applicants were hired on a first-come, first-served basis, including alcoholics and others with known problems, and excluding those with prior related work experience, salable skills, or community leadership roles. WETC has operated on the premise that appropriate selection criteria for this job are not understood. The project seeks to determine the qualities actually needed for satisfactory work with young children as well as the rehabilitative potential of the work itself.

Because of the open-hiring policy, it was necessary to provide a flexible job design. The teaching function is central to the program purposes, and all hired were tried out in teaching roles. Those who did not respond after a period of exposure, or found that the job was not one they desired, were retained in administrative or custodial functions. As of the spring of 1967, 42 aides are employed, half as teaching aides. Although there are men employed, and the program seeks to employ men, over half are women. This the staff attributes to a bias on the part of the SES staff, who tend to consider pre-school work as female employment.

Although the original intent did not extend beyond a demonstration, the staff is now considering future job possibilities for those employed, as well as the ultimate potential for institutionalizing the roles developed in this program. There is little doubt that most could qualify as teacher aides in the regular Rochester school system but these jobs are probably not only a regression in function, but are few in number and generally part-time. Some schools, for example, employ one aide to cover the 15-minute daily break for each teacher, the release period stipulated in the agreement with the local teachers' union. According to staff, this is a baby-sitting and not a teaching-assistant function. With the school budget in Rochester tight, prospects for full-time jobs are not favorable at present.

As a consequence, the staff is contemplating expanding their program to provide internal upgrading for the subprofessionals. Under current conditions, the newly hired are paid at the rate of $1.72 per hour, for a 40-hour week, and considered trainees. After two years, they receive $2.13 per hour. It is now proposed to alter and extend this progression so that after one year subprofessionals would attain the first level above a traineeship. A second level would be established for those with six community-college credits in relevant courses and a third for those with twelve credits. Upon receiving eighteen college credits, the subprofessional would attain the new classification of assistant teacher. The job gradations would be reflected in pay increases. In local community colleges, however, appropriate courses related to upgrading, are generally not available and are not likely to be developed, unless the subprofessional teaching role gains wider acceptance.

An additional part of the project's work is to gain recognition of the new subprofessional-professional relationship in education. To this purpose, a training handbook has been prepared for publication and their subprofessionals have presented panel discussions at teachers' meetings. WETC staff have been extending their training competence to Head Start, after-school programs, and other special projects. Their ultimate goal is to be able to test their staffing model inside a regular school system. Considerable interest in the program has been evidenced, but the project staff is aware that to employ subprofessionals in teaching functions on a regular basis will require substantial changes in the whole structure of educational services, especially if there is any attempt to move beyond a pre-school setting.

The year-to-year basis on which the program exists makes advance planning and design of evaluation difficult. The program has been under continual evaluation, using as a control group aides of similar backgrounds who function in the conventional helper-to-teacher role. It is believed thus far the present staffing pattern will prove to function at least as well as the traditional pre-school utilization of subprofessionals.

The Newark School-System Teacher-Aide Program

In July of 1966 a proposal was drafted for the Newark school system. Designed by Dr. Frank Riessman for Scientific Resources, Inc., the proposal envisioned a complete career continuum in the schools, providing two subprofessional positions. One was an entry level, the teacher aide,and the second, a subprofessional promotional level of assistant teacher. In addition, the program provided for training and accreditation mechanisms to permit promotion of subprofessionals while engaged in full-time work. Potential upgrading sequences were planned from the aide level to full teacher certification.

The job of teacher aides, designed for high-school graduates or those who would obtain an equivalency during a three-year period of employment, was proposed as a full-time, 40-hour-a-week, 11-month job, at a salary of $4,000. The recruiting goal was to attract equal numbers of men and women. The classroom functions were those commonly accepted as the aide's work of assisting individual teachers in monitoring, housekeeping, and other supportive and noninstructional tasks. Classroom activities were to be supplemented by work in after-school and summer sessions to round out the job to full-time. After-school tutorial or other assistance to individuals or liaison with families were additional suggested activities.

After one year's experience, all aides were to have the opportunity to become assistant-teachers-in-training and, through a work-study arrangement, to progress to full assistant-teacher status. The assistant was to function in the instructional process, tutoring individual children, conducting small group drills, and assisting in the library, or in independent study, or programmed learning. The proposal noted the necessity of obtaining permission from the State Board of Education for the use of subprofessionals in such functions on an experimental basis.

The training format proposed consisted of a pre-service period of three months of half-day training and half-day work within the classroom. In-service training was to be continuous, combining systematic on-the-job training and formal accredited educational courses provided by the colleges and teacher-training schools. The proposal further suggested the establishment of clinical professorships at local colleges to carry out the career-training program of both field-based and classroom courses. The object was to enable aides and assistants to enroll in accredited programs while engaged in full-time work.

All aides were to be invited to participate in the upgrading program, with the expectation that most would be able to gain nine to 15 college credits per semester, mainly in field-based courses. To become a full assistant-teacher would require 60 college credits, including 12 in education. Additional credits would be available towards a B.A. degree and full teacher certification.

In effect, the proposal not only offered the possibility for upgrading subprofessionals, but also provided teacher training that would emphasize experience in a laboratory setting in the development of certified teachers. The creation of a master teacher level was suggested, designed for those who would serve as project directors, supervising both teachers and subprofessionals. The expected outcomes extended beyond the subprofessional career ladder. A secondary goal was to stimulate teachers to develop new techniques and individual styles by providing them substantial assistance in the classroom.

To recruit teachers in the program, without imposing the program upon them, the proposal suggested allowing the teacher to decide whether or not to participate, and to compensate him or her for the extra work involved in the introduction of new categories of workers.

The proposal described above, designed for foundation support, was never funded. In February, 1967, the Newark School system entered into a project under the auspices of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. In this project, 225 aides to both kindergarten and first-grade teachers are employed in the parochial and public schools covered under Title I. The objective is to extend the Head Start programs into the regular school grades. About two-thirds of those employed work in kindergartens, where one aide is assigned to each teacher. In the first grade, one aide serves two teachers. No provision has as yet been made for any promotional levels or any other components of the original proposal.

The training component, subcontracted to Scientific Resources, Inc., consists of a two-week program in which teachers and principals also participate. Aides are released one day a week for in-service training. In addition, teachers were offered two all-day sessions prior to the assignment of aides, and two full days after the aides commenced work.

There are some 3,000 applicants for the 225 positions. No tests were used in selection and virtually no formal requirements were established. The sole criteria were residence in Newark and general indications of reliability and ability to perform noninstructional work with children. Aides work 6½ hours per day at $2.00 an hour. The after-school remediation programs, suggested to permit a wider range of aide functions and a full 40-hour week, have not as yet been instituted.

According to Dr. Charles R. Kelley, of Scientific Resources Inc., who is in charge of training and evaluation of the Newark Title I Project, it was necessary to limit the program to a standard teacher-aide formulation to get it under way. In order to develop the assistant-teacher level, the state rule that prohibits uncertified personnel from serving in instructional tasks would need to be modified, and this remains for the future. Some of the school personnel are committed to the "new careers" concept, and consider the initial phase of the program a step towards implementation. Some teachers are already allowing aides to perform tasks technically considered instructional. The program staff permitted the aide job to be relatively unstructured in order to allow individual teachers to test out in practice the relationships with auxiliary personnel. Initially, it is reported, many appeared to see the aides as "strong backs" to unload stock or police play areas. The object is to counterbalance this attitude by training that emphasizes effective team work. Some teachers are already forming effective working partnerships with their auxiliaries.

The hope is that experience and training will move the program toward a career concept. The trainers are now working with teachers' groups to develop a concrete subprofessional job structure, and to engage their support for removing or reexamining the state regulation that proscribes the use of auxiliary personnel in instructional functions. The college accreditation of training towards upgrading is problematic. Colleges are apparently not as yet ready to participate or accredit in-service training. A mutually satisfactory relationship in education between an employment project and a college remains to be developed.

THE WORKSHOPS

3

THE WORKSHOPS

Of the four separate workshop sessions, the first, second, and fourth were divided by field -- health, education, and welfare -- and retained the same chairmen and participants. The third session was interdisciplinary. In this way, the issues in the development of subprofessional roles could be explored in depth in each field and also viewed across the board. Plenary sessions and open discussion of workshop chairmen's reports provided further opportunities for the three fields to exchange views and experiences. Since all of the issues connected with the development of subprofessionals are to a large extent interrelated, discussion at times unavoidably overlapped.

The workshops were divided fundamentally in two unequal parts -- "demand," the problems of establishing subprofessional jobs and careers, and "supply," the problems of developing people to fill the jobs. With deliberate emphasis, the first three sessions concentrated on considerations of demand, which have received less attention in the past than those of supply. For each session, suggested questions for discussion were provided. Summaries of each workshop discussion follow. It was from these workshop discussions that the basic conclusions and recommendations of this report were drawn.

Dr. Eli Ginzberg opened the workshops with an address, "Revolution in Service Employment," a digest of which is included.

REVOLUTION IN SERVICE EMPLOYMENT

From an Address by
Dr. Eli Ginzberg, Hepburn Professor of Economics
Director, Conservation of Human Resources, Columbia University

NCEY Conference
June 22, 1967

The major forces at work in the labor market, and more specifically in the service economy, of which health, education, and welfare are a part, set the framework for the conference deliberations. These are a few basic characteristics of the current manpower situation:

-- Only one-third of the American population is currently engaged in the manufacture of goods -- including agriculture, mining, and construction. The remaining two-thirds are engaged in what is loosely called production of services. Thus, we have moved far away from a goods manufacturing economy.

-- Even within manufacturing, we have shifted from blue-collar to white, since there are increasingly greater proportions of factory workers in cost control, engineering functions, etc., than in physical labor.

-- Notwithstanding the focus on technological advance, its application is severely limited and can be readily applied only where output is standardized and large. Everywhere else -- and especially in the services -- technological possibilities will, in my judgment, continue to be restricted.

-- The economy we are leaving possessed, relatively speaking, a better wage structure than the one we are entering, especially in durable goods manufacturing where wages of $2.50 and $3.50 an hour are not uncommon.

-- In the old economy, a tremendous number of small steps moved employees up the career ladder. From unskilled entry jobs in the yard of a steel plant, for instance, there are some 18 steps to the skilled level of furnace tending.

-- This manufacturing economy was substantially male and strongly unionized.

It should be noted that the factory is a unique prototype which, through organization of work loads and tight supervision, can use unskilled manpower effectively and quickly. Beyond this, factory output can be analyzed and evaluated to determine precise, qualitative controls.

Between factory conditions and those in the service economy we find striking differences.

-- The services, employing two-thirds of the working population, encompass a fantastic range of people, thus leading to obvious complications. In the hospitals, for example, personnel spreads from the unskilled sweeper to the highly-trained neuro-surgeon, with top and bottom levels and all intermediary ones working together.

-- The preponderance of women -- 80 percent in health and welfare, and a substantial majority in education -- significantly affects the structure of service organizations.

-- The service organizations were late to unionize. Conventional labor leaders, successful in creating transportation, construction, and manufacturing unions, have shown little ability to organize the service organizations; we see instead the beginning of a new indigenous leadership.

-- The problems of organizing service institutions are intensifed by their non-profit or government-supported nature.

For a long time the law protected these institutions, so that not only was there no trade-union competence, but the institutions themselves were protected from labor organization. This protection is waning. In most of the more civilized states and in the Federal government there is clear permission for trade-union activity. And laws that interdict striking have proved ineffective. There is now a trade-union movement that in my opinion will grow very rapidly with vast implications for wage structures and working conditions. Non-profit organizations also can no longer hide behind the immunity of non-profitability. In this context it's important to emphasize the vast overstatement of the non-profit factor. For example, about 96 percent of total non-profit hospital income is paid for by the patient, insurance, or the government.

-- With respect to the nature and scale of operations in services, it is necessary to distinguish between systems and operating units. While government as a city, state, or Federal employer is in total a large unit, the individual school, hospital, or welfare agency is not. Services, unlike goods, must be produced where the people are. Both the consumer and the producer of services are immobile. A hospital to serve Atlanta must train and employ personnel in Atlanta, and probably in a particular area of Atlanta. This is one of the peculiar qualities that delimits the nature of economics of scale, both in production and in the development of personnel.

-- Throughout the human services it is extremely difficult to devise effective measures for output. Consequently, there are, for example, two extreme evaluations of health-service output in the United States. The conventional view is that we are greatly understaffed, with too few doctors and too few of all staff categories. The opposite, somewhat cynical view, which I share, is that the public spends too much on drugs and on doctors and benefits too little. Such opposite views can exist because there is no real measure of the relationship between medical intervention and the results. Similarly, the popular idea is "keep people in school longer -- school is good," not because it's beneficial to sit in school, but because it is good to learn something. Available data -- for example, that compiled by the surgeon-general for the Army -- indicate that Negro youth in the southeastern part of the United States are not learning in school. Even though they are in school only six months less than whites, 75 percent of southeastern Negroes cannot read at an 8th-grade level. This evidences a fantastic gap between the time spent in the classroom and achievement. In welfare it is common knowledge that though units of service can be measured, effectiveness cannot.

-- Not only is the wage structure in the service field inadequate, but so is its organization in terms of training and supervision. Diffuse management, which must oversee all types of personnel, is responsible. Who has the authority in hospitals? The doctors? The trustees? The supervisors? Who in education? The teachers? The superintendents? The Boards of Education? In the services, as opposed to manufacture, identifying responsibility is virtually impossible.

-- The civil-service system, which delimits managerial discretion, generalizes rules of public employment, and prevents managers from playing public politics, further throws responsibility into question. Therefore, if neither the money nor the manpower has flexibility, mismanagement, by definition, ensues. Not a spoils system, but some managerial flexibility is primary.

These characteristics of a service economy clarify the fact that the problems of manpower -- the input -- must be seen in the larger context of the problems of output. Can output be intelligently determined? Some assert, for example, that the schools have been reasonably successful instruments for two-thirds of the population, but have never even made a pretense of educating the last third.

If teachers are to define education, are they to be held responsible for the result or forced to redefine the problem? The problems of the ghetto community, for instance, its participation in and relationship with the schools and in turn with the power structure, cannot be solved by the teachers alone. If professional groups can be held responsible for non-delivery, some service areas can be freed for new kinds of manpower. But if not, it may be impossible to examine the issues and the professionals will continue to preempt the field. The example of education is not unique.

Responsibility stands beside output. At the moment, a hospital administrator, for example, is responsible to no one but the trustees and then only in budgetary matters. He oversees, but does not essentially control, the flow of dollars. He may hire porters, but he controls neither the doctors, the nurses, nor, effectively, patient intake. New patterns of use cannot be developed without responsible managerial power or without regard to the problem of output.

Effective employee performance is obviously related also to some system of rewards and incentives. Each service group is interested in protecting itself, and unless some steps are taken to dissolve these protective boundaries new patterns of employment will not be easily devised. Questions of professional jurisdiction arise. To eliminate manpower abuse, a genuine sharing and an entirely different allocation of dollars may be necessary.

But the United States is a big country, with the advantages of diversity. Regionalism, which can result in variation in staff utilization, promises much. Not all experiments need be new. A potential resource, generally unutilized, lies in the systematic interpretation and exploitation of already tested variations in manpower usage. In addition, experiments can be conducted to test significant new patterns of utilization. But the possibilities for improved manpower utilization must be studied in relation to the totality of input and output.

Existing training facilities must also be closely scrutinized. Resources in larger communities could be more fully used for cooperative education and training. Cooperation between employer and community can make economy and efficiency possible.

In sum, nothing will happen unless management responsibilities are clarified and latitude for constructive action is broadened. Hidebound, locked-in structures with no scope can create nothing. Management and labor must strike a balance between wages and opportunities because opportunities are part of the wage bargain. Sensible bargains can be made, I believe, if manpower and its utilization are understood. I favor rapid unionization of the service centers because I'm convinced that that's the only way manpower will ever be rationalized.

Educational requirements must be reexamined if personnel is to be used more intelligently. It's become perfectly clear to me, during the many years of my interest in mental health, that it's much easier for a certain personality type with eight grades of schooling to do a good job as a mental health aide than it is for, let us say, a nurse with a master's degree. Although ability to perform in certain areas has nothing to do with education, the potential of the subprofessional group must be realistically assessed, but must not, out of enthusiasm, be exaggerated.

Just as it is possible to consolidate training, so it may be possible to consolidate the several professional labor markets, conceived in broader terms. This will not only facilitate recruitment and training, but will increase opportunity.

Finally, it will be wise to play fair with the public. To do a better manpower job will cost money. The discrepancies between current service goals and operations are so wide that if manpower is better utilized, improved service rather than reduced cost will result. Ultimately, however, new service patterns may lessen the rate of cost increase.

I leave you with a fundamental question: Do you want the services managed? If you do, you must determine first how to proceed internally, and then how to proceed externally.

WORKSHOPS I

THE FULLEST USE OF SUBPROFESSIONALS IN HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

The objective of the first series of workshops was to develop a potential model of subprofessional roles in each of the three fields, assuming the existence of optimum conditions of training and supervision and the absence of administrative, budgetary, or other problems. The goal was to explore the extent to which the use of subprofessionals could improve prospects for a fully-functioning service system on the basis of "blue-sky" projections. It was not intended that the first workshops would consider barriers to the attainment of the ideal model, since these were the subject of subsequent sessions.

Of the two elements basic to the considerations, the first concerned the conceptual issues connected with the appropriate areas of subprofessional function. These included questions concerning the differentiation between professionals and others, the nature and organization of the services to be provided, and the manpower intent of the employment of subprofessionals. The manpower issue involved such questions as whether subprofessional jobs are intended as sources of professional recruits, as permanent work levels, or as upgrading opportunities for clerical and custodial personnel, and whether the jobs are to be provided only in special areas of service or as integral to the total agency services. The second element concerned questions of operations--the actual duties and tasks that subprofessionals could perform.

A few key questions were suggested for each of the three sections to indicate the kinds of issues they might discuss.

Section A - Health Chairman, Dr. Howard J. Brown, Administrator
Health Services Administration, New York City

Suggested Questions:

1. Does the present conception of subprofessional roles as exemplified in current employment result in underutilization of manpower potentional of this group, and as a consequence of the professionals as well?
2. In what alternative ways could subprofessionals be used that might not only alleviate manpower problems, but also enhance the health services provided?
3. Under existing or alternate conceptions of the subprofessional role, what would be tasks of subprofessionals?

Health differs from education and welfare in that substantial numbers of professionals have been functioning in this field for a number of years. What emerged as the central concern of this first health workshop, then, was whether current subprofessional employment should be the model, providing its known deficiencies can be corrected, or whether a more radical revision of health-service goals and systems of delivery is necessary.

The initial focus was on existing deficiencies in subprofessional employment, the first of which was the generalist-specialist split. It was felt that subprofessionals are automatically downgraded by the system because they operate as generalists in a highly professionalized and specialized atmosphere. One example cited was the case of nurses' aides, whose job description covers anything and everything, including how to clean the kitchen sink. "When management generalizes," said Victor Gotbaum, Executive Director of District Council #37, "it also downgrades." But most aides do not perform all the unrelated tasks in their job descriptions; instead, they function in more or less specialized work areas which, at least one panel member felt, could easily be isolated and given new titles.

While many agreed with this viewpoint, some thought that overemphasis on specialization tends to be a barrier both to horizontal and vertical movement, or, to be more specific, to the ability of a worker to move to the same or similar work levels in other organizations, or to advance. This is especially true when establishing specialties demands licensing, certification, and educational credentials.

Other participants were of the opinion that increasing specialization is a danger to the whole field and has led to fragmentation of health care. They advocated the creation of a new kind of generalist and felt that subprofessionals with proper training could help to fill this role. Specifically, subprofessionals could be a factor in bringing modern health care into the communities and in relating health to other human service areas. Dr. Tuerk noted the need for such generalists in the mental health field to counter the growing impersonality of professional service.

One panelist suggested that the widespread unhappiness with the use of the term subprofessional -- or nonprofessional, paraprofessional, aide, etc. -- stems from a basic unhappiness with the jobs themselves and with the barriers that have been set up between these jobs and the work of the professionals. Some considered these barriers arbitrary, not viable in actual practice, as, for example, in municipal hospitals where aides have been functioning as nurses for many years. The point was made that licensed nurses are often indistinguishable in terms of their day-to-day duties from unlicensed aides.

"Had we conceived of the fact that aides are carrying out a role that may not be professional but is certainly not unskilled," remarked Dr. Brown, "we might have done it differently." But perhaps the most serious deficiency in the current model, apart from low wages, is the lack of career ladders and mobility for people already in subprofessional jobs. There was general agreement that these deficiencies must be corrected and that the institutions themselves must provide the means for horizontal and vertical mobility. "We are the victims of a situation of neglect," said Leon Davis, of the Drug & Hospital Employees Union, "because we have never provided the means or incentives for people to be trained." Although some doubted whether upward mobility is the goal of all personnel, most felt that opportunities had to be built into the system.

Among the suggestions made during the discussion for insuring development of career lines were:

1. In-service training and internal staff development

2. More entry-level and trainee-type jobs and provision for lateral entry at all levels
3. Paid leaves of absence for the acquisition of formal educational credits and accreditation of skills in their performance
4. Job analysis, starting with jobs not presently being done and redefining them to be filled by subprofessionals who have received some training

It was suggested that the whole job hierarchy may need reevaluation,not only from bottom to top but from top to bottom, so that the work of the professionals could also be scrutinized. It was agreed that in the current setup professionals, though always busy, are in fact underutilized. This is especially true of nurses, much of whose time is taken up in non-nursing duties. Some considered that opening up the professional domain would enlarge rather than enroach on the scope of professional activity. Workshop members felt that professionals often limit themselves to narrow channels and are neither innovative nor creative in terms of their own field. One participant called for the creation of a higher category than professional, the "superprofessional," to go beyond the restricted range of current professional concerns.

A basic question was whether subprofessionals could function in ways other than lightening the tasks of professionals or filling existing shortages Many of those present agreed that new spheres of subprofessional activity would be compatible with the revised thinking about the organization and goals of health services. As Dr. Brown stated: "Expanding and broadening the concept of service is basic to conceiving of the new group we're talking about. We are now moving to deliver service on the basis of need, and it is becoming the government's responsibility to see that everyone gets service, even though the government may not actually provide such services."

A subsidiary question raised was whether the added services were needed only for low-income groups. Some thought that the real goal in health would be to provide a true one-class system, with the same services and care for all groups in society. Others argued that, in reality, the poor will need more and different types of service for some time to come.

The exact shape of future health care was difficult to predict, but some trends were noted. Chief among these is the trend away from institutionalization, moving patient care away from hospitals. Another is the decentralization of services by establishing facilities in the communities being served, especially in disadvantaged areas. Some felt the role of the solo practitioner, who is not now the primary medical care provider in low-income communities, would decline even further over the next few decades.

Organized planning on the basis of community needs without reference to existing structure was deemed necessary. As Mr. Grubb said, "Let's start doing the things that need to be done and add the structure later. We need to think first about how to provide better care and then develop the structure that will accomplish this goal and provide for the type of personnel needed to staff it."

Jobs that could and should be created were identified:

- -- Social work aides: to work with patients in communities and hospitals
- -- Homemakers: to help patients recover in their own homes
- -- Halfway house aides: to care for those who no longer need hospital care but have no other place to go
- -- Educational, recreational, and neighborhood workers
- -- Geriatric workers
- -- Community mental health workers: to work with families, with individuals, and assist teachers in diagnosing children's problems
- -- Counseling aides: possibly themselves ex-addicts or ex-alcoholics, to deal with such problems as alcoholism and addiction
- -- Health-education aides
- -- Preventive-medicine aides
- -- Medical aides: to assist physicians in such tasks as taking histories and providing human service
- -- Middle-management-level aides in hospitals: to perform and supervise functions in record-keeping, supplies, laundry, etc.
- -- Patients' advocates in hospitals

To develop new subprofessional roles, most panelists agreed with Michael March of the U.S. Bureau of the Budget that "we need some measures of productivity in education or performance; we need pay scales commensurate with the value of services rendered; we need training to upgrade the capacities of all personnel; we need to enable people to take advantage of available training opportunities; we need to eliminate artificial labor restrictions and institutional barriers that seriously interfere with ability to function; we need to end the misuse of professionals and revamp backward managerial techniques."

As to the future, Dr. Rosinski, summarizing the views of the panel, said: "The strong feeling among many members was that we need to decide on what kind of health care we want and the system of delivery before we can describe a model."

A note of caution was sounded by Dr. Tuerk when he reminded the group: "We have been proceeding on the assumption that we know what to do in health, but perhaps there are things we don't yet know that may be more important."

Section B - Education   Chairman, Dr. Norman Drachler, Superintendent of Schools
Detroit, Michigan

Suggested Questions:

1. Can the subprofessional play a role in the instructional process or is he limited solely to noninstructional functions? In all schools? In only preschool? In only disadvantaged areas?
2. In terms of the consensus on question 1, what could the subprofessional duties be?

The first education workshop opened on a note of general accord. All agreed that subprofessionals have a role in education and that their potential has barely been tapped. The panelists devoted a large part of the session to an exchange of experiences with subprofessionals in their particular school systems, from which became apparent that no consistent model currently exists. Variations were wide: duties ranged from custodial jobs to limited classroom teaching; remuneration, from part-time hourly rates to full-time salaries; opportunities for upgrading, from none to well-worked-out levels for advancement; and educational requirements, from 10th grade to three years of college.

Described in the course of the workshop were several types of programs. In the state of Washington for instance, of the 2,500 aides employed, one-third work in the lunchrooms or playgrounds, and two-thirds in the classroom, reading to young children, tutoring, and preparing instructional materials. Pittsburgh's 350 aides are divided into nonprofessional and subprofessional categories. Nonprofessionals function as mental health aides, team mothers, pre-primary aides in Head Start classes, and bus and lunchroom aides. Subprofessionals, who are required to have some beginning college credits, assist teachers in the Head Start program and are case aides in the school social-work department. Both categories lack tenure, but otherwise receive full fringe benefits. Detroit has developed five categories for its 1000 aides:

1. Technical: highly skilled in a special area, such as photography, audio-visual services, etc.
2. Instructional
3. School-community relations
4. Clerical
5. Service, both custodial and monitorial

Within these categories, aides perform a wide variety of tasks in audio-visual, library, and recreational services, to name but a few that expand the scope from generalized assistance. One result of the Detroit experience was that the standard aptitude, achievement, and personality tests used in the selection of teacher aides were unreliable measures of effective performance. Speculating on this, one participant questioned whether the same might not hold true for educational levels: Is there any real connection between educational attainment and job performance? Many considered this an important question, since not only do most programs require different subprofessional levels and in terms of continuing education, expose the fundamental dilemma: Should subprofessionals be involved in the instructional process? While some felt that the principle of differentiating teaching and auxiliary staff roles was obscure, others rejected the notion altogether. David Selden reported the American Federation of Teachers' view that "teaching should be done by teachers and that is why we feel aides should be called school aides rather than teaching aides. Teachers see themselves in a struggle to professionalize teaching and they see further compartmentalization or specialization as running counter to this goal. Most teachers view team teaching with deep suspicion."

To this Mr. Sexton added, "Until teachers become fully professional, and this can only happen when they control entry into their own profession as doctors and lawyers do, subprofessionals will be seen as a threat."

Although most panel members felt that aides are vitally needed to mitigate the continuing teacher shortage, there remained an unresolved conflict. Are aides being used, it was asked, as an expedient born of the teacher shortage or as a permanent method of enriching the educational process? In even broader terms, some questioned the nature of the educational system itself and the place of the aide within it, as related both to the structure and the process of education. As Dr. Letson said: "Are subprofessionals to be superimposed on the traditional instructional structure? If this is so, we are talking about a limited and temporary proposition. The question is what kind of reorganization of the educational structure is necessary. There must be a basic rethinking of the whole instructional approach. Without this, we are all spinning our wheels and leaving only a limited role for the aides."

Since the essential unresolved question was whether there was a role for subprofessionals in the instructional system, a subcommittee composed of the participating school superintendents met the following morning and agreed that supportive services of aides should range from the custodial level upward and should include teaching services. Dr. Drachler enunciated the subcommittee consensus when he said, "Each school has a need for a multiplicity of services which can be performed by non-certified personnel." Those services, it was agreed, would:

1. Free the teacher to use his professional skills to the fullest;
2. Provide children with more individualized or personal attention which, though necessary, does not require certified personnel;
3. Provide a reservoir of manpower whose roles may in some instances be terminal but which will in all instances leave doors open to higher levels of service; and
4. Be best used if they were developed by teachers, counselors, and members of the staff, in order to maintain mobility, on the one hand, and professional standards, on the other.

a high-school diploma, and in some cases even more, but such advancement as provided within systems is almost always based on the completion of college credits.

Apart from specific usage, some of the general issues of subprofessional job design and its actual development were discussed. Joint determination and planning with teachers was considered the best way to formulate job descriptions, and unions and aides as well should participate in the bargaining process. Such planning has been lacking in most current programs, nearly all of which made use of Federal funds, because planning time and staff were seldom provided in the Federal grant. To insure that aides would become a permanent part of school systems, panel members advocated advance planning and allocation of money in future budgets for subprofessional personnel on a longer range and more secure basis.

A major current concern was with the precarious state of funding and the need to terminate programs, should Federal support be withdrawn.

A further element in planning concerned what political jurisdiction should decide the functions of aides. Many felt that though the states should encourage the subprofessional concept, fullest development would be best insured if decisions were left to local districts, since statewide licensing standards often tend to restrict local experimentation and innovation.

A major issue in determining subprofessional roles inheres in the ambiguities of the role of the teacher, a role that must be more clearly defined, according to some, before subprofessional tasks can be identified. As Mrs. Elizabeth Koontz, Vice President of the National Education Association, said. "Teachers were not prepared for an administrative post within the classroom. We were asked to delineate the duties of an aide when we had never really thought of sharing that load with anyone in an instructional area. Consequently, I think we have neglected the most important element and that is the preparation of teachers for a new design and a new definition of what a professional teacher should be."

Redefining the role of the teacher in terms of responsibility rather than of operation was suggested as one method of making teachers full professionals. As Dr. Ladd, Director of Teacher Education of Emory University, said: "It's not important who performs a certain operation -- who explains a problem in long division for the third time to a kid who hasn't gotten it -- but who is responsible for it. And this is something which has not been recognized as yet, either legally through certification regulations or in practice."

Dr. Cosand, President of the St. Louis Community College District, suggested that role differentiation is already possible. To stimulate the process in his organization, a percentage of the budget was allocated for research and development, available to teachers for developing new subprofessional jobs. "As a result," he noted, "a variety of subprofessional jobs have opened up. By contrast, similar aide structure was initiated in a neighboring school system, but failed because it was imposed upon the professional staff. We feel our program succeeded because we allowed the teachers to explore the possibilities themselves."

Career ladders, and all they imply in terms of defining actual duties for

Section C - Welfare   Chairman, Norman V. Lourie, Executive Deputy Secretary Public Welfare, State of Pennsylvania

Suggested Questions:

1. What role can the subprofessional play that is integral to the primary welfare-service functions?
   a. Can subprofessionals function within the casework process? In eligibility determination? In rehabilitative services?
   b. What are the implications for subprofessionals of the changing and expanding service goals of public welfare?
2. What tasks now performed by others or not performed at all could professionals handle?

Because the experience with subprofessionals in the welfare field is more limited than in either health or education,it became clear to the welfare panelists almost from the start that they had to look beyond the present. The members believed that they could neither limit subprofessionals to their current role in public welfare nor to those tasks now performed by professionals that could be performed by subprofessionals. This was considered only a fragment of a much larger issue. As one member said, "We can't stop at defining the subprofessional work assignments in terms of the professional's job. We must look more broadly at what needs to be done."

The participants agreed that manpower shortages in welfare would grow more critical in the future and that, in addition, new demands would be made for expanded services, services which are presently offered by no one in public welfare.

The fundamental problem, however, to which the panel returned repeatedly during the course of the discussion, concerned professional function. There was overall recognition that before any consistent subprofessional role could be established, it was necessary to define the professional role.

Current staffing patterns vary widely. In Minnesota and Georgia subprofessionals are used in outreach work, case finding, and locating foster homes for children, whereas, in the other states, B.A. caseworkers are used for these jobs. In Georgia, moreover, a B.A. degree for caseworkers has been required for only a few years. Within the existing structure, however, subprofessional areas could be broadened to include:

1. Assignment of certain kinds of cases such as old age assistance, in which there is usually little change,
2. Separation of eligibility from other services, to let subprofessionals handle it, even though this would necessitate simplifying current eligibility procedures, by substituting a simple declaration form for eligibility,
3. Establishment of new job levels and identifying, as not requiring a bachelor's degree, such services as administrative aides, for which the Bureau of Family Services has formulated guidelines.

These suggestions refer to jobs in areas of service now provided. As for those not now provided, a wide variety of tasks, all of which it was felt could be performed by subprofessionals, was enumerated. In fact, many members thought that subprofessionals, especially if they were indigenous, would do a better job than professionals.

Because these are practical services, rather than traditional casework, it was assumed that aides know the intricacies of stretching a dollar, coping with poor housing, facing the realities of life in low-income communities. It was therefore concluded that, in a kind of blue-sky projection, subprofessionals in welfare could help in:

- -- Housing and living arrangements
- -- Practical counseling on food and money management and consumer education
- -- Homemaking
- -- Employment: job development and placement and preparing clients for employment
- -- Family planning interpretation
- -- Legal referral and counseling
- -- Working with groups of clients on community problems
- -- Services for marginal or special groups in society:
    - -- The aged: social care for the aged
    - -- Parolees and those released from mental institutions
    - -- The handicapped and retarded: special care and services and parent education to prevent the institutionalization of handicapped or retarded children
    - -- Children: child care, staffing day care centers, finding foster homes and screening foster parents, parent and child education.

Many felt that, as Mr. Lourie said, "We haven't begun to make any investment in this country in services to children. For $300 a year per person you could take everybody off old age assistance and put them to work in children's shelters as foster grandparents -- their salaries would cost just $300 more than public assistance."

How, then, will these tasks fit into a career line? Is the problem the model of helper to professional and is the casework model itself a problem? The possibility of promoting case aides to caseworkers, according to Mr. Hursh, "represents a real danger to a very unprofessionalized profession." In health, it was pointed out, subprofessionals perform one specialized or particular aspect of a professional job but do not become full professionals; why should not this be true in welfare? But many believed that defining specialties does not create a career line. "Are these specialties, then, discrete cubicles from which no movement is possible?" Mr. Aronson asked.

Here the workshop returned once more to a consideration of the role of the professional: Can one call caseworkers, whose only qualification is a B.A. degree, professionals? And might subprofessionals do what B.A. caseworkers are currently doing? Some thought this possible. "It's not too revolutionary to suggest that aides can do the job," Mr. Baldwin commented, "and if they can do the job perhaps we have invented a straw man of a baccalaureate caseworker and surrounded him by institutionalization."

Others disagreed somewhat, suggesting that studies be made to determine what B.A. caseworkers, especially those with some undergraduate social work training, should be doing. But, as Mr. Hursh said, "if they can't do their work better than someone with no education or other training, then our whole approach is wrong and we should say that everything rests on an individual basis and formal education is irrelevant."

The crux of the matter seemed to be that there are no measures of performance or output in welfare. As Mr. Torgerson remarked, "We can't say one method is more successful than another because we really don't have any standards to measure success with cases." The truth of this statement was conceded by everyone, all agreeing that this is an area for further study.

Of the two possible models suggested for using subprofessionals, one was to relegate to professionals problems centering around interpersonal relations and assign all other functions to subprofessionals; the second was to use professionals as supervisors and directors of a team of subprofessionals.

The urgency of the manpower problem in welfare was mentioned throughout the session. Current standards are not being met, let alone projected expansion. Even when there are enough college graduates to fill available casework positions, turnover is so high that as one comes in another goes out, as though casework were a revolving door. The problem devolves not only upon supplying personnel but upon keeping them.

Fred Steininger of the Welfare Administration of HEW, noting the Federal requirements, as of July 1, of a maximum of 60 cases per worker, said, "Every state is having trouble and I don't think we'll be able to use the Federal sanction of withholding money; the reason they can't meet the standards is they can't find the manpower."

In spite of the present crisis, the panel went on to consider the future direction of welfare. In the opinion of the majority, there will be an increased qualitative as well as an increased quantitative demand. Welfare, it was generally thought, should be moving to provide a range of services for all people and not only for the poorest segment of society. The provisions of Medicaid, which extended eligibility to include those not on welfare, were cited as evidence of this trend. Several noted their agreement with New York City Commissioner Ginsberg's reported view that social services for the poor have generally been poor services, and it is necessary to think in an expanded framework of the social service needs of the whole community. The new focus, however, is so far removed from the traditional casework, caseload system of categorical aid that it proved difficult for the panel to construct a model that has much relevance to current practice.

WORKSHOPS II
THE CHANGES NEEDED, AND THE OBSTACLES TO CHANGE

In the second series of workshops the objectives were, first, to identify the significant changes in hiring and promotional policies, in the occupational mix and the job hierarchy, and in the organization of service delivery necessary to implement the models developed in the earlier sessions; and, second, to determine the primary obstacles -- institutional, professional, budgetary, and regulatory, among others -- obstructing required changes. Participants were asked to concentrate on the most urgent policy changes and the most recalcitrant obstacles. This session was devoted not to the means of overcoming such obstacles but to an analysis of them in depth. To this end it was suggested that first the obstacle must be identified, necessary changes in professional attitudes, functions, and education determined, and resistance to change considered.

Sample questions were: What are the causes of this resistance? Is it primarily a problem of salary levels? A fear that management is seeking a cheaper replacement for professionals? Or is it that the subprofessional is a threat to professional status and unchallenged authority? Do professionals fear that the use of subprofessionals will increase professional workloads quantitatively (by requiring them to train and supervise others) or qualitatively (by taking away from them the less demanding tasks)? Are the expressed concerns with the possible dilution of quality and violation of professional mores real issues, or are they manifestations of the traditional response of those who are "in" to others attempting to gain entry? By whom is the resistance displayed -- by those already employed in the agency, the associations or unions, the educators, the community at large?

Section A - Health Chairman, Dr. Brown

Because of the low pay and terminal nature of most health service jobs, the panelists in this session were concerned with the consequent poor status and image of all health occupations, excepting that of physician. The image conjured up by society, the participants indicated, results from a social lag, in which the work done by paramedical personnel is improperly valued, and the doctrine that the total population, including the poorest segment, deserves decent health care, is only nominally accepted.

The lack of upgrading occasioned much comment. As Dr. Chope said, "What's missing in our system is the opportunity for moving up without time, money, and unbelievable motivation." Mr. Grubb, discussing the same question, felt that the question of upgrading is related to the unsolved problems of accrediting job experience versus reliance on academic credits. He suggested that this can be overcome by equating work experience with some part of academic training and noted that San Francisco plans to incorporate academic programs as a mandatory part of the first few years of employment in the new careers development.

Some saw the need to redefine jobs to provide the career ladders necessary for upgrading. This would require rethinking the professional functions to provide intervening levels between the professional and subprofessional, now too far apart to offer promotional possibilities. In line with this, Dr. Brown suggested creating assistant or subdoctors, a category questioned by Dr. Taylor, Mr. Leff, and Mr. Davis. According to Mr. Davis, this might imply a new class of doctors for the poor. "I wouldn't want a half-doctor myself," he said. Mr. Leff added that the general public is unprepared to accept the subprofessional in new roles; many people, for instance, refuse to let anyone but a dentist clean their teeth. "Socially we are not ready for an assistant physician," agreed Dr. Taylor. "There's a big difference between this and a physician's assistant, and it's not just a semantic difference."

Dr. Grant, however, pointed out that broad redefinition of jobs is possible by reassigning such simple skills as taking blood pressure and monitoring equipment, both of which can come within the province of subprofessionals. Such redefinition, he said, would bridge the gap between the low-paid, low-skilled groups and the highly-trained. The only way to solve the manpower problem is to mobilize these groups. "We have the people and the money and we could create the jobs. What is needed are connections between the jobs, the money,and the people and the mechanisms to make the process come about."

Discussion concentrated on the limited upgrading opportunity in nursing or the patient-care sequence of occupations. Registered nurses, whose jobs have so little mobility, are not only in short supply but do not increase numerically. As Dr. Moed noted, the nursing schools graduate each year just enough nurses to fill the places of those who have retired. He contended that a new labor pool is needed and that the logical source is the group of current hospital employees. Mr. Davis agreed, remarking that practical nurses,in addition to aides and orderlies, were also a source of supply. The discussion, he felt, was unnecessarily complex. "Nothing inherent in the structure prevents the creation of new jobs. We are the ones who have created the problem of deadend jobs and rigid standards which prevent opening up the system." Dr. Moed suggested that the preoccupation with upgrading might be overstated. "You don't have to permit upgrading to the M.D. level, only to a level that pays a living wage."

To the list of obstacles, Mr. Davis then added the insistent one of low wages. The miniscule pay given aides in hospitals has, he said, downgraded subprofessional jobs. "Everyone in a hospital is a nobody, except the R.N. and the M.D. No man who has any self-respect or ambition would take a job in a hospital. Factory workers have a better image and better pay. Service jobs which pay so little money are not considered desirable and, as a result, attract only minority group members because no one else will take them." This point was substantiated by Dr. Levine, who reported that a study to determine work areas of interest to high-school students revealed that health occupations offered little appeal. Even the salary of a registered nurse is not very high, a fact that closes the field to many, most particularly men, for whom there is a specific need in health jobs and perhaps in nursing itself.

Are there other factors contributing to the poor image of health occupations in addition to substandard wages and terminal jobs? Mr. Davis contended that "money alone won't change the image. We need to value the worker and his work." In Dr. Grant's opinion, the poor image results from the fact that the worker performs only unimportant functions in a distinctly professional environment, thus emphasizing the necessity for assigning the subprofessional more highly regarded tasks. Dr. Brown, describing some of the interpersonal elements involved, noted that doctors seldom know or greet the aides. Perhaps, it was felt, aides essentially serve the patients in ways seemingly unrelated to medicine and to doctors. Or, as Dr. Chope put it, "Did anyone ever see aides go on rounds with doctors?"

Mr. Davis added the question of institutional structure and practice. Hospitals, in his view, are autocratic institutions where professional authority -- no one except another doctor questions a doctor's judgment -- pervades all hospital administration. Absence of democracy is reinforced by absence of upgrading. Supervisory personnel -- even those who supervise floor-cleaning -- are usually brought in from outside and not promoted from the ranks. Thus supervisors are not responsive to those they supervise and lower-level people have almost no say in their jobs. Dr. Levine noted that the structure of Federal hospitals appears to occasion greater job satisfaction and results in a much lower turnover rate. In these hospitals, subprofessionals are called assistants and are placed on career ladders, some of which may be rather limited. Nonetheless, everyone is part of a planned personnel system, which includes benefits and increments. Everyone, too, is integrated into a total plan for patient care, wherein the M.D.'s who are full-time staff members and the assistants are part of a team; thus they all know each other.

At this point, Dr. Chope asked why psychiatric aides in state hospitals seemed to have higher status than those in other hospitals, and Dr. Lieberman replied that the advantages for psychiatric aides are unique to Dr. Chope's state of California, where there is careful selection, usually of high school graduates, and good training. In Delaware, by contrast, there are no educational requirements and very little in-service training, both of which contribute significantly to poverty of image and status.

A further point, that few jobs in health are totally independent of doctors or nurses, raised the question of professional resistance. Mr. March noted that professionals objected to broadening the subprofessional scope because the quality of care might suffer. In his view, "Just as low subprofessional standards and productivity can become a barrier, so too can over-insistence on quality. Inferior quality is dangerous as well as unproductive, but equally dangerous is a standard too high to be met. The real obstacle here is a false professionalization and emphasis on narrow professional boundaries instead of a linkage of all human services by their common denominators." Dr. Dunner characterized health occupations as a "guild system" full of such legal complications as liability for malpractice in some jobs not even performed by doctors. A tangle of inflexible standards is built into licensing regulations.

Many agreed that there will be resistance to the threat of encroachment on the professional domain. Encroachment will be charged when, for instance, professional roles are redefined to permit upgrading opportunities for subprofessionals. A contrary opinion offered evidence that role definition is in fact constantly taking place. Nurses' organizations, as Dean Schlotfeldt of Western Reserve School of Nursing noted, are concerned with the underutilization of nurses and are eager to have ward clerks, supply assistants, and other categories of staff to relieve nurses of peripheral functions. In mental health, to Dr. Tuerk, there is a blurring of roles to such a point of crisis that it is presently almost impossible to determine the boundaries of different jobs. Mr. Leff, however, considered this blurring a sign of development, indicating greater latitude and demanding formal recognition.

Another obstacle is the absence of management systems and of clear responsibility for job design and service delivery. Or, as Dr. Rosinski put it, "Who will make the decision to identify and develop the ladders?" Dr. Chope suggested that a major overhaul of the managerial approach is needed and warned that, if the health profession failed to move in this direction and use personnel more effectively, electronics will replace the human factor. Others felt that hospitals need to cooperate in developing systematic approaches to job design and coordinated training. Dean Schlotfeldt predicted that as nurses' salaries rise, management will be stimulated to examine what nurses do and free them from clerical and other non-nursing tasks. "The revision of management systems," in Mr. March's opinion, "is difficult because of the dependence in health on public money." And others concurred, referring to the chaotic allocation of public funds and the myriad Federal grants that complicate management and tend to obscure even the findings of research.

Is the connection with anti-poverty goals an obstacle? One panel member questioned the connection between goals of combating poverty and the need to expand the service goals and delivery of health care. It was felt, however, that the connection was strong, since "you are talking about jobs for the undereducated and it is the poor who are undereducated." Also, the pool of unemployed is a basic manpower resource for this field, and experience has proven that there is a constant source of deprived people who are capable and motivated to function in a variety of subprofessional roles. In any event, the connection of health and anti-poverty goals is clear and strong.

The major obstacle to the development of the broader concept of health service, and with it the development of subprofessional jobs of sufficient stature, according to Dr. Brown, is the lag in social consciousness. "If we really thought that poor people should have their teeth filled and get decent medical care, we would create the jobs." This lag is reinforced by the traditional fee for service, solo practitioner system. It was observed that the further a doctor is removed from solo practice, the more he is willing to accept ancillary personnel. Doctors who do everything themselves in private practice usually make use of assistants when in group practice or in a clinic setting.

All agreed that the tremendous unmet health needs among the low-income population cannot be ignored. This, in principle, was accepted, but the workshop was unable to spell out its application in any detail. Moreover, the major focus was on the urgent manpower needs of the existing services.

Section B - Education Chairman, Dr. Drachler

In the second education workshop the major obstacles to creating new subprofessional roles appeared to be professional resistance and fears, legal barriers and certification requirements, and ignorance of what really constitutes good teaching and good education. Besides these, but given less emphasis, were the temporary and special nature of current subprofessional programs and their connection with the anti-poverty program.

The discussion was largely conceptual, centering chiefly upon the nature of professional resistance, which proved difficult to define. The experience of several participants indicated that teachers were not hostile to aides, even allowing some a role in the instructional process. Indeed, many panel members believed that aides are readily accepted when they are recognized as a resource and not unilaterally imposed upon teachers by the administration or through a bargaining agreement.

But this opinion was by no means unanimous. There is often resentment of aides, whose presence in the classroom means additional duties for the teacher without additional time for planning, and whose duties are designed without benefit of teacher involvement. According to Mr. Selden, however, "The biggest obstacle is who is paying for the aides. If the teachers feel they are paying for them, they may prefer that the money be spent on raising teachers' salaries or on fringe benefits. You don't always get what you pay for in education, but you can't get good education without good money."

In commenting further upon causes of teacher resistance, some panelists thought the teacher might fear exposure of his work to someone else and exposure as well of his inability to make use of aides. Teachers, accustomed to working in complete isolation, have not been prepared to work with others. But an alternate view suggested that the issue has deeper roots stemming from a basic resistance to change, which, it was conjectured, might need be drastic if subprofessionals were to be used in a more meaningful way. To broaden the subprofessional role would require changes in salary scales, in staffing patterns, and in the jobs of the professionals themselves. And it is to these ultimate possibilities that teacher resistance is addressed.

Ignorance of what constitutes good teaching and good education -- a major weakness -- further complicates the problem. At present there is insufficient evidence to prove that money spent for aides contributes more to education than equal sums spent for increasing teachers' salaries or for new technological equipment. What, then, is the rationale for the use of aides? Dr. Drachler said, "The empirical basis for the improvement of education is the reduction of class size, but this is not attested to by research. It is so widely accepted, though, that it has become something of a shibboleth. The use of aides is not a part of reducing class size but proceeds on a different theoretical basis: permitting the teacher to handle a group more effectively by reducing her tasks."

To this, Mr. Selden responded, "The real resistance is the suspicion that the aides would be used as a device to increase class size." He also added, "Most of the research on class size shows how much you are able to increase it without bad effect. There has been little research on the effect of drastic reduction in class size, but its beneficial effect is known. The investment in personnel in a school system does not pay off in direct proportion. In order to accomplish something in education, you really do have to spend money on adult personnel -- not only teachers -- and the better you can pay them the better people you can get."

It was felt by some that the merits of alternate investment are not susceptible of exact cost accounting but such benefits as reduced class size and the use of aides must be estimated intuitively. The absence of any precise logic or theory about classroom management inhibits educational innovation. But according to some, there is already enough empirical judgment to support the use of aides. "We must," said Dr. Letson, "evaluate the use of aides in the last analysis in accordance with an assessment of the educational returns. We cannot examine the subprofessional questions on any other basis, such as creating jobs or giving the teacher the help she deserves. I am convinced that if we can divide the job and employ professionals to give direction and supervision to others we can purchase a larger educational return from a given number of dollars."

The lack of commitment on the part of the education profession to the subprofessional concept was considered a fundamental obstacle. In view of this, some panelists felt that the only practical course is to start using aides and overcome the resistance in the doing rather than wait for substantiated research evidence. To this Dr. Rumpf of the U.S. Office of Education added, "We also need to be able to show some educational results and some way to measure the educational outcome. The teaching profession as it now stands has few provisions to evaluate superior performance and does not in fact pay for superior job performance." Other participants agreed that there have to be new standards and new ways of evaluating performance. As one member commented, "We have one of the best mediocre programs of teacher training in the country and the credentials standards currently being used are not very closely related to performance."

The subject of legal barriers to the use of subprofessionals is complex,because certification requirements for teachers vary and laws prohibiting the use of non-certified personnel in the instructional process, in effect in many states, are not universal. Moreover, according to the participants, in practice there are differences in local interpretation of state rules. Both types of legal requirements are frequently circumvented. Non-certified teachers are hired under special or provisional licenses, and aides are employed in titles or in accordance with stated job descriptions that may comply with the statutes, but are used as local school systems or individual teachers see fit. Such use may indeed be in some aspects of instruction. It was recognized, however, that attempts to revise existing laws to expand the role of non-certified personnel in more than a substitute or unofficial capacity in the instructional process would undoubtedly encounter resistance. The central legislative direction is toward raising requirements for all educational personnel.

Subprofessionals in the schools today are employed mainly in Federally-funded programs and are temporary and not integral parts of the school system. This has freed the schools from strict adherence to personnel requirements but has imposed other limitations. The necessity to develop crash programs has allowed little or no staff time for advance planning. Moreover, the aides' employment has been almost completely focused on anti-poverty considerations. The reactions of the group to this focus were mixed. In the opinion of some, employment of subprofessionals in programs designed primarily to help the poor or undereducated may prevent the subprofessional from achieving permanent institutional status. Moreover, if subprofessionals are hired to work only with the poor or disadvantaged, the recipients of such services may feel shortchanged.

Certain advantages to employing members of minority groups in the schools were noted: greater willingness on the part of institutions to recognize the capabilities of minorities and improved attitudes of minority communities toward the schools. But, on balance, the groups' view appeared to be that the optimum use of subprofessionals would only be attained when they were hired as necessary and supplementary resources to improve the total quality of education, albeit emphasizing the particular improvement of education for the disadvantaged.

No one, it was felt, really knows what the school should be doing. In noting, for instance, that education has never accepted involvement with the community as one of its responsibilities, Dr. Drachler commented, "I don't know that we can't teach the disadvantaged. We have never had a chance and the teachers have never had a chance." In the last analysis, a major problem detected is the current confusion over the role of the school in contemporary society. Because of a lack of clear direction, the participants agreed with Dr. Dolce that "The greatest obstacle is our inability to rationalize the subprofessional position in a structure that makes some sense to teachers, to the school system as a whole, and to citizens in the community. My fear is that we have something that is going to grow without contributing to educational output. The real problem is not whether we want it to grow -- it will grow, professional resistance or not -- but whether it will grow with any meaning."

Section C - Welfare Chairman, Mr. Lourie

The welfare group identified numerous obstacles to the development of subprofessional roles. Among them were Federal and state funding policies, the established national personnel and work standards, union attitudes and policies, budgetary limitations, and merit systems or civil service requirements. But as the discussion progressed, all were seen to emanate from three principal problem areas -- the rigidities imposed by Federal and state standards, the resistance engendered by the anomalous position of the professionals, and the lack of public acceptance and support of public welfare services.

In each of the three areas, the discussion began with a specific problem and attempted to probe the underlying reasons for the existence of this problem. In discussing Federal policies, the first concern was the current formula for Federal reimbursement to the states. In 1962, the amendment to the Social Security Act provided for a 75 percent rate of reimbursement for certain defined areas of social service, compared with the normal 50 percent rate. While the group was aware that the intent was to stimulate states to provide rehabilitative and preventative services, it was generally agreed that the policy in practice probably is a deterrent to the use of subprofessionals. For, although the regulation stipulates that the test be the type of service rather than the type of staff providing the service, in practice, the preponderance of support at the higher rate has been for services provided by caseworkers with, at minimum, a college degree. In a few instances, work performed by subprofessionals in jobs as homemakers or group workers has been reimbursed at the 75 percent rate. But some proposals for the employment of subprofessionals, in California, for example, were rejected for this higher rate of coverage.

It was noted that administrators would be loath to devote the time and energy necessary for developing a subprofessional career proposal when faced with the likelihood of a lower rate of reimbursement as a consequence. And Mr. Steininger agreed that, although the Federal authorities can reimburse at the rate of 75 percent, any state that puts forward a well-developed proposal for the use of subprofessionals, the rule, as it stands, may be a deterrent. "But," as he stated,"the rule can be changed." Mr. Lourie summed up the group sentiment by stating that "any pattern of Federal funding tends to militate against innovation, unless it offers positive stimulus to subprofessional employment."

Related to the reimbursement formula and reinforcing administrative reluctance to employ subprofessionals are the Federal educational standards for personnel of a Bachelor's Degree minimum for caseworkers and the caseload maximum standards of 60, both recently established as national norms. The general view was that states, confronted with the necessity of meeting the caseload maximum, and receiving no credit toward this standard for essential parts of service performed by subprofessionals, will have little reason for considering their employment. As Mr. Hursh said, "What's the use of the Federal Administration recommending and encouraging the use of auxiliary staff, if they count for nothing in meeting the caseload standards." There was some feeling that the caseload standard of 60 was itself a barrier. It was hypothesized that a team composed of one caseworker and several subprofessionals could provide adequate service for a larger group. Mr. Steininger demurred. "You get no credit for subprofessionals," he said. "In the Federal view this is correct because 60 cases are too much for one caseworker unassisted."

Concerning interrelated Federal policies, the emerging consensus was that neither the precise percentage of reimbursement nor the number of cases set up as a standard constitutes the real obstacle, which, as Mr. Hamilton said, "is a uniform and unrealistic nationwide standard. That's the basic obstacle from a public administration standpoint, for any fixed arrangement tends to penalize innovation." And Mr. Lourie suggested that welfare problems are complicated further by the fact that each of the several activities comprising the welfare services are funded from separate sources and on different bases. Under such a network of regulations, an administrator at the state level, and even more so at the county or city level, has relatively little freedom or incentive to attempt creative policies.

As to the caseload standards, Mr. Torgerson suggested that the precise number of cases mandated may not be at issue, but rather the tendency to cling to the casework approach, which may be inappropriate to much of public welfare services. Close adherence to a casework model was regarded as symptomatic of the second area of obstacles -- those flowing from the influence of the social work profession. Although graduate social workers comprise only a small minority in social-work agencies, they fill the administrative and policy-making posts and influence greatly the funding policies. Within the social-work profession, resistance to subprofessionals centers on the casework concept, a concept based on treating the whole client and antithetical to assignment of parts of service to others. As the predominant group in social work, the caseworkers' influence filters through the graduate social-work schools into undergraduate schools and inculcates the college graduate caseworkers employed in public welfare agencies. The B.A. caseworker, according to Mr. Lourie, is only grudgingly accepted by the profession, as evident in their exclusion for membership by the National Association of Social Workers, and anyone less than a college graduate is anathema.

Against the background of the professional stance, the group felt it was not surprising that the B.A. caseworker also considers subprofessionals acceptable only as temporary expedients. Mr. Baldwin described their resistance to the subprofessional concept as "a complex of reasonable and unreasonable fears." First they themselves are not accepted as true professionals, and their status is not fortified by the usual elements of special training, degrees, licensing, or some other unassailable credential. "And after fighting the know-nothing elements in a community who denigrate the work itself," he says, "the fear that both their status and their wages will be undermined by subprofessionals is not without foundation." Mr. Aronson added that the caseworkers' standing depends on a general level of education, rather than specific competence. And it is this general educational level that is built into the merit system classification scheme. Therefore, as Mr. Hursh said, "If you suggest that those without education could take over some of the college graduates' functions, you are attacking the sole basis of their status and rate of compensation. To those who only recently convinced the old-line county commissioner that a college graduate could do a better job than just a plain motherly woman, the advocacy of subprofessionals appears to be a regression." In addition, several noted that among the caseworker group there is some genuine concern for the quality of service.

Added to such fears are the artificial credential barriers by which all craft-type vested interests blindly tend to protect the status quo. The personnel structure of welfare agencies is tied tightly to specified educational levels with few gradations within each classification, thus limiting opportunities to improve the admittedly low rate of compensation for all categories of staff. The extent to which such rigidities are reinforced by union policies varies from one community to another. In Georgia there are no unions of any significance representing public welfare employees. In Philadelphia and other communities, where all public employees are members of one industrial-type union, the problems are fewer than in those communities where caseworkers are organized separately. "Both the merit system and the unions," as Mr. Aronson pointed out, "are faced with the identical problem of attempting to make some equitable distribution of the inadequate appropriation for salaries for welfare personnel."

Although budgetary limitations within which welfare administrations work are often considered a major obstacle to manpower innovation, inadequate funds were perceived rather as a symptom of the major obstacle -- the lack of public regard for the welfare programs. "Welfare," according to Mr. Lourie, "has a negative social feel." It was the general consensus that this negative attitude on the part of the public and of legislative bodies at every governmental level affects not only the size of appropriations but the controls placed on their use.

A curious anomaly, noted by many, exists in the willingness of American society to provide funds for the social and economic problems that make people dependent on public welfare -- illness, old age, children, and even poverty - and the refusal to give equal allocations to those problems in the context of welfare services. The favored treatment accorded mental health activities in legislatures and Federal administration was cited as evidence. Not only is more money readily available to mental health activities because, as Mr. Robinson noted, "legislators feel more kindly disposed towards this work because they have relatives and friends who need the service," but, in addition, Federal funding is provided at a 75 percent rate for all types of service without requiring case-by-case accounting. In Mr. Lourie's words, "Money that the Federal government gives out for staffing welfare agencies is tied to an ancient 'poor law' concept -- that's the real obstacle."

Mr. Lourie and others consider the most striking evidence of the discrimination against welfare services the favored treatment given to OEO projects. Under OEO auspices funds are available not only at a higher rate of reimbursement, 90 percent compared with 50 to 75 percent from HEW, but also with fewer controls and greater freedom from traditional requirements. Moreover, subprofessionally-manned centers were funded directly, while funds were not granted to welfare agencies for the provision of similar services by subprofessionals. Mr. Robinson noted that, at a time when the nation was concerned with waging a war on poverty, it was impossible to arouse public or legislative concern for the imminent expiration of amendments to the AFDC programs, the expiration of which "will bring us back to the old formula of providing aid only if the man in the family deserts."

As the workshop reached its conclusion, it became the apparent consensus that all three problem areas -- the Federal policies, the professional viewpoint, and the negative public image of welfare -- were interrelated. The poor image of public welfare is a factor in the understaffing, in the low wages of its personnel, and in the rigid controls imposed on the use of funds, factors that in turn limit public welfare agencies' ability to provide positive social services. Welfare administrators, endeavoring to move from a preoccupation with financial assistance for specific categories of individuals to a more comprehensive and positive social welfare program, face many problems.

Several suggested that perhaps a lack of imagination and creativity on the part of administrators was an additional obstacle. The majority, however, seemed to feel that the negative view of welfare in the public eye, and the consequent controls imposed on its operation, could inhibit all but the most committed administrators. "Not all administrators," Mr. Lourie concluded, "believe that subprofessionals can contribute to this goal, and some lack the necessary courage to tackle the many obstacles in the path."

WORKSHOPS III

OVERCOMING THE OBSTACLES

The purpose of this session was to consider the strategies for overcoming the obstacles identified and analyzed in the preceding session. Because many of the problems are similar in health, education, and welfare, the groups were constituted on an interdisciplinary basis. Each field has experience and information that is valuable to the others and the workshops afforded an opportunity for an exchange of views on common issues. Divided into four sections, each considered one of four broad areas of obstacles. They were:

Section 1. The problems of administration, management, and institutional structure

Section 2. Professional and educational credentials

Section 3. The problem of low-paying, one-level, deadend jobs

Section 4. Budgets, politics, and community involvement.

For each section some broad questions were suggested for discussion.

Section 1 Chairman, Mr. Morris Hursh, Commissioner, Department of Public Welfare, St. Paul, Minnesota

Suggested Questions:

The major concerns here are the means for making the changes necessary to institutionalize subprofessional roles in an accepted and standardized form and as an integral part of the organizational structure.

1. To what extent should the subprofessional role be defined as an independent entity or left to the discretion of the supervisors? If it should be defined, who should determine subprofessional function--professionals, civil service, personnel departments?
2. How can you standardize subprofessional jobs without building in new rigidities?
3. How can you secure the necessary changes in hiring and promotional policies to allow for subprofessional careers?
4. How can merit systems be relaxed to allow for employment of subprofessionals without destroying such values as protection against patronage and the spoils system?
5. How do you deal with those already employed, and the unions and associations that represent them, to achieve reallocation of functions and a new occupational mix, without distrupting the organization?

Discussion:

The consensus in this session was that achieving changes in internal hiring and promotional policies depends heavily on administrative leadership and creativity. Not only must administrators enlist the support of the vested interests -- unions, professional staff, etc. -- but they must allow the directors of individual departments or agencies some latitude for experimentation and improvisation. Outside of their own organizations, administrators must work intensively with such groups as civil service commissions and municipal personnel departments to negotiate the necessary changes in civil service requirements, merit systems, and other Federal, state, or local regulations.

Although change is hindered by a host of bureaucratic controls, the administrators believed in general that their ability to improve the condition of subprofessional employment was also severely hampered by their ignorance of how to build a personnel policy based on something other than education. As Mr. Grubb put it: "We really do not know what are meaningful criteria. We have depended for so long on high-school graduates, for example, that we don't know if a specific job really requires only a 6th-grade education. We've played it safe because we don't know. To delve into the real needs of any particular job takes money and lots of time. It needs trial and error to find out if those you choose are successful, unsuccessful, or too successful."

When it comes to career ladders, as Mr. Aronson pointed out, the same problems exist. "A flexible personnel policy would take account of individual differences, but do you have the knowledge to build such a policy? Because performance standards and ratings in most occupations are unsatisfactory (and this is true even in manufacture, where you have objective criteria), there is an attitude that it is necessary to screen out people initially or there will be no controls. All that most people have available is education as a measure of general ability and the persistence to reach a stated goal. The alternative -- to say you will appoint people without screening -- seems total abdication. If you have no real performance standards, how can you tell? Usually you resort to examinations which are themselves based on education. We need a great deal of analysis to develop measures of potential. Once people are in, they have aspirations irrespective of their ability." In human services in particular, there are few measures of the success of the total service output. Evaluation of individual performance, therefore, is extremely difficult.

But the need remains, as Mr. Meyer said, "to do the job of identifying qualities and skills the best we can." Most participants agreed that, although study and evaluation were vitally necessary, they must proceed according to the knowledge they already possess. "Perhaps," said Dr. Riessman, "the subprofessional will be the stimulus to evaluating professional service."

The difficulties of evaluating the whole service suggests the need to consider subprofessionals as a separate group. In Dr. Tuerk's words, "the subprofessional role should be defined as a distinct entity. It is a function of management to lead in this development." In this connection, he recommended that each major state department have within it manpower personnel charged exclusively with the responsibility for studying and developing manpower plans. The implication was that, because management has had neither the time nor the means to give sufficient consideration to manpower problems, it has tended to accept the inherited structure and try to work within it.

Professional resistance, an issue which seemed impossible to ignore, had its place in this discussion. Dr. Drachler noted that the most effective strategy in overcoming such resistance is to bring in subprofessional personnel to do the jobs that the professionals themselves have described as nonprofessional. This opinion has been substantiated in the Detroit school system, where resistance diminished when the subprofessional's role was not superimposed.

It was also suggested that the value of subprofessional employment be pointed up by including some elements of it in the curricula of professional schools. Mr. Meyer noted that in the Wayne State School of Social Work part of the training has been in public-service management. "Since the problem is to persuade those already employed, in-service training can help and is a necessity."

But the major emphasis in this workshop centered not on professional resistance but on the administrative rules, especially in civil service and merit systems. In the California welfare department, for instance, the traditional system was changed so that the service needs dictated the assignment of cases. Some like those requiring only financial assistance, were handled by subprofessionals. "This system," said Dr. Chope, "got dynamited by Federal and state regulations. When social workers found out we were using clerks as part of a team to dispense welfare funds, they were up in arms. Our system violated established policy and so it had to be stopped. Experimentation at the local level is strangled by Federal and state rules."

Mr. Steininger mentioned that the Federal welfare administration is very much aware of this problem and recognized that certain changes need to be made. "The severe manpower shortage," Mr. Hursh suggested, "might serve to relax the rules, many of which are administrative rather than legislative." With this point Mr. Grubb disagreed. "The more acute the shortage of social workers and others," he said, "the more they want to raise the requirements."

However the manpower shortage affected regulations, the question remained whether administrators should attempt to circumvent them or work to change them. In the opinion of some, it is easier and better to set the wheels of professional job activity in motion first and attack the legal aspects of the problem later. In the opinion of others, a creative administrator can make possible many changes in the rules and can often convince antagonistic professional groups. As an example of this, Mr. Grubb said that in San Francisco the unions and professional groups are going to be paid to redefine the jobs.

But, it was asked, what are the issues involved in civil service, what is its role and what should it be, and what should be the administrator's relationship to civil service representatives? In Mr. Meyer's view, although civil service can cooperate actively with a service department in defining and developing jobs, it is the administrator of the department who must shoulder the major responsibility. Although many agreed, they posited that in actual practice trouble often arises out of proposals made to the civil service commissions. "Many times," according to Mr. Hursh, "civil service is the big problem. There is a question as to whether civil service is a servant of management or whether it has a separate status. They say the changes we want to make can't be done. They violate traditional policies."

Mrs. Poston, President of the New York State Civil Service Commission, explained that all civil service is governed by law, but that most barriers can be overcome. In her words, "If management comes to us and says that a certain job has to be done, and on the basis of careful analysis that the job requires the use of subprofessionals, then we will work with them and help them secure the needed changes. But you must bear in mind that a state civil service commission such as ours is the central personnel agency for every department in the state, and as such, civil service is also a management group." The management of civil service must provide a uniform and consistent pattern of public employment for all departments.

It is this need for uniformity that some saw as the difficulty. For example, in connection with wage scales, one administrator described some of the problems he has encountered. "I have in my employ highly paid workers who attained that pay status just by being there. And I have youngsters with considerable potential I'd like to pay more. No matter how I plead with my civil service commission about their skills, they are firm about the relation of wage and grade and there is little flexibility for that first step." As Dr. Chope commented, "Many times the rules and regulations we set up to kill the evil of favoritism handicaps administrative judgment."

There are some limitations, as Mrs. Poston and Mr. Aronson both admitted. Civil service statutory obligations require some spelled-out selection criteria and methods to protect the jobs from unrestricted patronage. Fundamental to any merit system is the need to insure equal treatment of all applicants and jobholders. Within these limitations, it was the view of most representatives of both civil service and merit systems, there is capacity for change, but much depends on the attitude of the particular commission or commissioner. Mrs. Poston said that "the New York State Commission is committed to the concept of subprofessional employment." Because this commitment paves the way for a flexible policy, Mr. Grubb suggested that a tactic to insure such commitment might be to involve civil service personnel and others who regulate hiring and promotional standards in the job development process, perhaps from the very beginning. In his view, civil service is charged with the responsibility to see that newly created jobs fit a total pattern of public employment, but also to assist management. For optimum results, "civil service commissions should function in an advisory capacity to administrators and should not be considered the adversaries of management."

It was generally agreed that management must lead in the development of subprofessional roles and in obtaining commitment from all concerned. The key, therefore, may be the administrator himself. He must not only shape the internal personnel policies of his organization, an area thought to present fewer difficulties, but also reach out in order to gain support from and changes in external controls. The administrator then is the key link in a long chain of "ifs" upon which the implementation of new subprofessional models depends. As Mr. Hursh, in summation, said, "If you have a smart administrator who can use a little ingenuity and isn't afraid to experiment, who happens to have a very good civil service department, a cooperative union, a reasonable professional organization, a good salary schedule for all classes, career opportunities for subprofessionals, movement laterally and upward -- then you're well on your way toward creating a viable subprofessional role!"

Section 2 - Chairman, Mr. S.M. Miller, Program Advisor, Office of Social Development, Ford Foundation, New York City

Suggested Questions:

1. Is the objective, with respect to subprofessional employment, to change or to eliminate credentials, or is it to change the processes by which credentials are acquired?
2. On what kinds of educational or other credentials should subprofessional employment be based, and how should these relate to professional education and credentials? What kinds of licensing and certification are appropriate for subprofessionals?
3. How do you loosen credential policies without destroying professional values and integrity?
4. How do you gain professional acceptance of or commitment to the employment of subprofessionals?
5. How can professional schools, associations, or unions of professionals play a role in developing subprofessionals?

Discussion:

While the questions raised in this session far outnumbered the answers given, the expression of concern over professional standards was general. It was agreed that the subprofessional concept seems to run counter to the primary professional tendency toward upgrading the status of the professions and the accompanying necessity to raise requirements. The idea of revising the traditional standards of education, training, and formal accreditation for subprofessionals constitutes a serious threat to the professional. But, on the other hand, it was argued that forms of training other than the accepted ones of degree, education, and professional accreditation are needed if subprofessionals are to be fully utilized.

The tendency in the past has been to equate training with college study, and therefore, according to Mrs. Koontz, "People who think the question is whether all formal or academic training should be disregarded really believe that only colleges can provide such training." She maintained further that while it might be necessary to work within the present framework "it need not be accepted as final or the best."

But if credentials do not provide perfect measures of qualification -- and there was general agreement that they do not -- what else will serve as a yardstick for potential? Dr. Ladd, spelling out the kinds of evidence that best predict performance, suggested that it would have to be determined empirically. "Will probationary employment do it?" he asked. "Tests? Formal education? We can't answer the question in principle, but we need to operate on the basis of judgments determined experimentally in the light of the particular job."

In the ensuing discussion it was agreed that subprofessional entry jobs present relatively little difficulty if they are defined as simple, concrete tasks. It also was the consensus that entry levels be freed from all but the strictly job-related requirements, except where special qualification is needed to protect public safety. For example, Dr. Allen remarked that in the state of Washington no licensing or other requirements have been set up for teacher aides. "My own view," he continued, "is that hopefully this will be indefinite. Experience in dealing with those things indicates that the most common role of a state agency is to regulate and control. I hope the role here will be one of stimulus and encouragement." But his choice of words, noted by the group, implied an uncertainty that such freedom from control would long continue.

Moving up a career ladder, however, it was generally agreed, poses serious qualifications problems that probably cannot be solved by existing means. Most were emphatic in their view that satisfactory performance as an aide is not a satisfactory basis for promotion to more responsible work. Exemplifying this is the hypothetical case of a skillful visual aide who could operate all the requisite equipment, but could not be expected to assume the responsibility for deciding when to use audio-visual materials and which materials to select. Movement from concrete practical tasks to those requiring an understanding of abstractions and the capacity to use professional judgment or discretion cannot and should not be automatic.

From the general issues this panel proceeded to specific promotional practices. In a voluntary hospital, Mr. Frawley noted, the lowest jobs have no requirements, and promotion depends to some extent on the judgment of the supervisor. "We have made exceptions to normal policy and trained people on the job to be technicians, even though the job description requires a particular educational credential."

This, it was noted, is feasible in a voluntary hospital but more difficult in public employment. But even voluntary organizations must meet the professional credential, for, as Mr. Frawley noted, "We can't move people into licensed occupations when the basis of the license is solely education." In other fields, public welfare, for example, all hiring is circumscribed. In Mr. Baldwin's words, "Some piece of paper is needed -- an exam or a rating -- even to sweep the floor."

The question was posed as to whether it was possible to loosen existing credential requirements without destroying professional integrity. In this context, Dean Schlotfeldt sought to distinguish between policies and procedures. "Policies," she said, "are the criteria determination underlying the credentials.

Procedures are the methods of obtaining credentials." In the interchange, although no full consensus emerged, it seemed that all would support modification of procedures, to allow for more part-time, work-study arrangements, and thereby to make the required credentials more easily obtainable. But whether the credentials themselves could be modified to substitute some form of accredited work experience in lieu of formal academic credits remained an open question. As one participant put it, "Do you raise the river or lower the bridge? Do you make it easier for people to get the piece of paper or do you adjust the requirements to the potential workers?"

The answer to this difficult question, it was agreed, is certainly not to put people into positions for which they are not qualified. And there was considerable dissatisfaction expressed with the usual expedient of raising stated requirements and then increasing the numbers of provisional appointments as a way of evading those standards. This tendency was of particular concern to school personnel, and considered likely to continue in the face of increasing manpower shortages. According to Dr. Dolce, "I could conceive that education could absorb all health and welfare manpower and still be inadequately staffed. We use the provisional certificate to circumvent requirements. But the alternative is to work toward further job differentiation so that the application of standards can be rigidly enforced with no exceptions."

Those who represented the teachers were not in total accord with Dr. Dolce's view. Mr. Selden suggested that teachers believe that the answer to the shortage is to put a higher value on education. "Society has been allowed to place a higher value on electronics than on education and this situation will obtain until we raise the ante." Mrs. Koontz stated the problem differently: "We need to avoid undermining the profession as a profession by making it appear so simple that it appears that anyone who can read himself can teach others to read, that anyone who can work out his own income tax can teach others arithmetic, and that the only role of teaching is basic education. But we are talking about the ways education can prepare for career mobility and in this regard I am not nearly so concerned with the teacher shortage as I am with making the teaching task more manageable in order to attract and retain teachers."

Few could see any rationale for lowering professional requirements, especially as Dean Schlotfeldt noted, "Experience in nursing suggests that professionals need more rather than less training if they are to supervise subprofessionals." And as for alternate ways in which subprofessionals could be upgraded to assume some professional tasks, little that was positive emerged. As Mr. Miller stated, "There are two problems to accrediting experience or qualities other than academic success. One problem is that it assumes that we know the optimal qualifications for a job. The second is that we know how to measure the existence of those qualifications and abilities in individuals." And he added, "I confess to skepticism on the first and enormous doubt on the second."

The knowledge gap was recognized by all to be a major limitation in the design of new accrediting mechanisms. In the light of current knowledge, then, what should be the professional role in defining the requirements for work in their own disciplines? The majority view was that the professions have the responsibility for maintaining quality of service and they should have, as one put it, "a compelling if not controlling voice in defining the needs of the service and how they could be best fulfilled." But there were some who suggested that if professionals did not adjust to current conditions and if "evasion of credential requirements were to become the only means of meeting social needs," leadership would develop in other quarters, perhaps in the political arena. This, it was suggested, has already happened to an extent; indeed there were suggestions that decisions made in open political processes might be preferable to those made in closed professional circles.

For the professionals, the problems inherent in defining new subprofessional roles clearly posed a dilemma. As Dr. Ladd declared, "If we think about immediate need we tear down professional standards. If we give the professions the power to clobber the public, if we think about raising standards, there is a danger of damaging the public interest. The way out is to define functions and take a fresh look irrespective of traditional models." But some considered that society at large also has a responsibility to the professionals. "Perhaps," said Dr. Grant, "if we had treated nurses better and paid them more and allowed them better development, we wouldn't have the problems we have today." One participant broadened this view by asserting that the professional problems are symptomatic of total managerial neglect of the basic function of staff development. It was his view that all institutions in health, education, and welfare that take human beings seriously and recognize the predictable manpower crisis should assume the responsibility for training and developing all its personnel, on company time if necessary. There were some demurrers, particularly on the ground of the added financial burdens, and the majority opinion appeared to be that the service goals of institutions were the first priority.

The training function, however, was one that most saw as needing expansion if alternates to academic credits were to be developed. The chairman in his summation felt that "it was apparent that the participants by and large did not look upon education as the sole preserve of the schools but favored the developing of new educational modes beyond the formal apparatus. I think many of us felt that the important point was to look at education in a much broader way than has been traditional, and actually begin to reflect upon the recent experiences we have had in developing new forms of educational activities."

Section 3 - Chairman, Mr. Mark Battle, Deputy Director, Bureau of Work Programs
U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.

Suggested Questions:

This section focused on the factors of job mobility and wage compensation, and the combinations of the two factors likely to result in stable subprofessional employment.

1. What is a viable entry-level job for subprofessionals?
2. How do you achieve some measure of horizontal and vertical mobility for subprofessionals? What are the limits of this mobility?
3. What wages and working conditions will produce a productive and stable subprofessional group of workers? How should these wages relate to professional compensation?
4. How do you get the career ladders and the related wage policies into effect?

Discussion:

The degree of opportunity provided by a job is a factor of the wages earned and the possibilities for mobility. This was agreed by all members of this workshop section. There was disagreement, however, as to which of the two elements should be emphasized. To some, the entry-level wage for subprofessionals was of less concern, for they envisioned this level essentially as a short-term trial period or training station. They reasoned that since unskilled, untrained workers cannot be paid an adequate living wage, the focus must be on training that will move them out of unskilled work as rapidly as possible. But others, doubting that many subprofessionals could realistically be expected to move beyond low-level tasks, felt that a decent entry wage was imperative. "I think we sometimes get overenthusiastic about the notion that everybody moves," Mr. Davis said. "The fact is that one out of ten might be promoted. We must be concerned with the capacity of the lowest level to earn a living." Dr. Riessman, however, suggested that the assumption that the majority will not move upward is inherent in current labor market conditions and not necessarily in subprofessional capacity.

Irrespective of the particular viewpoints, all were aware that the current wage scale in the human services, in which professionals are not highly paid, will tend to prevent increases in subprofessional earnings, with the depressant effect obviously the greatest at the entry level. Therefore, all were concerned with genuine possibilities for mobility and upgrading, for without such opportunities subprofessionals were unlikely to earn more than a marginal wage. If it is true, at least for the present, that upward mobility is not possible for everybody, then more increments based on length of service, horizontal mobility, and graded remunerations for each job level must be offered. Mr. Leff called for a "career salary plan for subprofessionals relating to living wages, with the higher ranges of subprofessional wages overlapping the lower professional salary levels."

Mr. Battle asked whether a minimum living standard was the sole criterion on which to base a wage scale; the panelists generally believed that either a living wage or a standard based on comparison with similar jobs were the only possible criteria.

So far as upgrading possibilities were concerned, it was a widely held view that the responsibility for developing promotional opportunies rests with management. Mr. Juras noted, from his experience with employing subprofessionals as home-finders, that administrators can create both a new role and upgrading levels by encouraging experimentation. After a trial period, it was demonstrated to the satisfaction of professional staff that subprofessionals were eminently capable of finding living quarters for welfare clients; thus the category became an established element of staff. As individual subprofessionals demonstrated increasing competence, a second subprofessional level was added to the welfare ladder. Mr. Yabroff agreed that managerial initiative was important if subprofessionals were to become an integral part of the staffing pattern. He noted that to date most subprofessionals have been hired to fill immediate needs, with no projected place in the job hierarchy, and this has contributed to their unsatisfactory status.

Dr. Riessman pointed out that although other models existed in the provisional teacher and the substitute, they needed dissemination and publicity. "A basic strategy," he said, "is to make it a multi-gain for all levels of staff, since you can't give access to upgrading for the bottom level without giving equal access to all levels, including the professionals. It has to be a win for everybody." Mr. Olanoff suggested the device of adopting the industrial practice of bidding for jobs, of allowing employees to compete for openings as they occur rather than bringing in outsiders to fill higher-level vacancies.

Since, in the opinion of the majority, the union should complement management's task of revising and redefining subprofessional roles, Mr. Rosen set forth the program formulated by his union to upgrade nurses' aides to licensed practical nurses. Significant in this program, besides the successful cooperation of labor and management, was the fact that existing hospital workers were able to move from the aide to the licensed practical-nurse level without leaving or disrupting employment relationships; they worked half-time as aides and trained for 25 hours each week, for which they received allowances. Their enthusiasm for the program was high. Mr. Davis added that in addition to such "train-while-you-earn" projects, on-the-job experience might be credited toward a next step, thus building a bridge between the professional and the subprofessional, and improving the profession in the process.

Although most of the previous discussion of career ladders had been tied to linking existing jobs, the panelists now considered other possible methods. Instead of differentiating tasks in only one organization, is it possible to move subprofessionals from one organization or locality to another? Can work be standardized to accredit experience in one field toward a job in another? What objective standards are to be considered and what is their value? Positively, it was agreed that standards protect those who possess qualifications from having to start at the bottom in each new job. Moreover, they are not simply credentials, but testaments to experience and performance. But when such standards attain legal stature in the form of licensing, they can become restrictive, especially since they tend to raise requirements.

Such a possibility was emphasized by Mr. Hudson's strong caveat: "Beware! That's the way they all start. In California now you need a B.A. degree to become a laboratory technologist." Thus the negative aspect of standards was highlighted, sharply illustrating the widely-acknowledged fact that standards -- licensing, certification, whatever its name -- have been used as restraints to keep people out and to send requirements up. Mr. Leff believed that there should be structured jobs, but not structured credentials and certification. "In other words, I favor a structure on the job or demand side but I would go slowly in structuring the supply side."

Since objective standards exist to a degree in health, although not in teaching or social work, it might be possible to discover common elements in subprofessional jobs in all three fields. The panel wondered whether some transferability, a core of transferable human involvements, could be made from one human service to the others. The problem with the core concept, in Dr. Moed's opinion, was administrative concern with a person's ability to perform a concrete function rather than with his ability in general human relations.

The need for consistent patterns of job design to permit the evaluation of experience, and thereby endow subprofessionals with some job mobility, led the group to consider the possibilities of expert job analysis. The administrators in this workshop section confessed to some skepticism as to the utility of such a service. Some considered conventional job analysis inappropriate to human services. Others noted from experience that if the staff is not convinced that there is a legitimate role for subprofessionals, the recommendations of job analysts will not be adopted. In the ensuing discussion, the group appeared to agree that the problem of developing subprofessional careers is not yet one of technical analysis. As Mr. Leff said, "I think the professions know what needs to be done to delegate functions. The problem is how to get the managers to be willing to do this -- even if you lay it out for them. Someone in the top management has to say 'this is the way it is going to be done.'"

Whether or not objective standards could be formulated, however, it seemed imperative to the panel that public agencies and human-service institutions begin to build mobility into their job structures. "The problem of public-service agencies," according to Mr. Davis, "is that no one really pays attention to them; no one pays attention to developing jobs, developing skills, and developing ways to improve service. Now that money is being poured in, a little more attention is being given to these things."

Using the example of the private hospital, Mr. Hudson said that an individual unit would never do the job. While one hospital might develop a career ladder, it would be geared only to its own set-up and therefore not transferable; in general, hospitals do not consider such developments economical on a broad basis. He believed that city, statewide, or regional planning was necessary. Here Mr. Rosen pointed out that municipal hospitals are the only systems capable of change economically; they might, he hoped, cooperate with university hospitals. Some participants, on the other hand, doubted whether administrators anywhere can realistically be expected to initiate anything. As one said, "Changes are made by collective bargaining, by public demand, and then become a social responsibility for which taxpayers pay."

In his summary of the workshop's discussion, Mr. Battle outlined a rough blueprint for future action: "We in the Department of Labor talked about bringing together essentially four kinds of people: representatives of professional associations and the unions as one group; national groups of agencies representing employers as another group; representatives of certifying and sanctioning bodies like the National Education Association and similar ones in medicine and welfare as a third group; and outside training organizations as the fourth group. Such a coalition would work toward the specific purpose of designing and engineering career ladders, coupled with appropriate training, but it would at the same time attempt to commit these groups to providing technical assistance toward implementing this goal across the country."

Section 4 - Chairman, Mr. Randy Hamilton, Executive Director, Institute of Local Self-Governments, Berkeley, Cal.

Suggested Questions:

The basic questions for this section were how to overcome the legislative, budgetary, and other regulatory obstacles to subprofessional employment.

1. How can the special obstacles at local, state, and Federal levels be overcome?
2. What sources of funding and conditions of funding should be sought?
3. What are effective approaches to the resistance of legislators, government administrators, budget officers, and the community at large to the introduction and utilization of subprofessionals?
4. What are effective approaches to the over-romanticism and over-commitment of some politicians, legislators, government administrators, and the community to the introduction and utilization of subprofessionals?

Discussion:

The focus in this group was on the types of support that need to be marshalled to move subprofessional employment to a recognized and meaningful status. Rallying support among the legislators in Federal government and especially at state and local levels was considered essential and the discussion therefore weighed the merits of varying approaches. The experience of administrators dictates a step-by-step approach, taking advantage of existing legislation and funds and attempting to secure modest improvements. But in the interchange the view emerged that, while eminently practical, such an approach would not be adequate for some of the major comprehensive policy changes needed. What should be sought is a broad basis of support for subprofessionals, encompassing all vested interest groups and the public at large as well. In this group, as in others, the role of management was seen as a primary catalyst, and management, therefore, must be "sold" if other support is to be gained.

The majority view was that in Congress there is already substantial interest in the subprofessionals, translated into significant sums in appropriations. The limitations of this support are mainly budgetary and regulatory policies, frequently at the administrative level. Although most of the group felt that additional and sizable sums will be needed, their prime interest was on improving the conditions under which support is currently available. In health, for example, the concern was less with total appropriations than with funds that provide or subsidize mechanisms for upgrading existing subprofessional personnel. Others, and especially those in welfare, were not as satisfied with current levels of spending.

The more immediate need, however, was seen by all as measures that would strengthen existing legislation by giving it more permanent or at least longer-range status. As Mr. Pragan said, "The Scheuer Amendment is after all only an amendment to temporary legislation." The heavy dependence in the schools on Federal funds for employing subprofessionals has limited the scope of planning and development of new roles. The "peak and valley" nature of OEO funds impairs the administrator's ability to evaluate their effect and plan and negotiate for permanent jobs. As Mr. Ellis said, "OEO was intended as a demonstration, and it did prove that some things can be done. But it has only scratched the surface. What is needed now is to incorporate the experience under OEO into the Social Security Law on a permanent basis."

On balance, although the Congress was considered friendly, their support needs to be expanded and to do this, according to Charles Carleton, aide to Congressman Scheuer, "will require continuous lobbying directed at all Congressional members who are sympathetic to the subprofessional concept." But as one participant said, "Federal programs come and go. For stable programs you need local support." There was general agreement that the subprofessional concept has not reached state legislatures or municipal government. Mr. Robinson illustrated this by referring to his experience with the difficulties in "endeavoring to sell the state legislature on picking up the costs of the 116 homemaker aides employed under OEO financing." Some suggested that OEO and other Federal programs should seek greater involvement with local officials or perhaps offer money only to those local governments who signify a plan to continue programs that have proved successful. But many recognized that building local support must be approached directly by local efforts. The question thus is how to "sell" the local political bodies.

In gaining support from legislatures, a proposal that saves public expenses generally has the greater appeal. The workshop considered the merits of advancing the subprofessional concept on this basis. For welfare agencies, which often find it difficult to loosen public purse strings, the most promising argument for creating subprofessional jobs is that they take people off the support rolls or save costs of institutionalization by providing service to the aged, ill, or handicapped in their own homes. But this tactic ties the subprofessional concept to jobs for the poor and many agreed with Dr. Nixon that "If subprofessionals and the poor are synonymous, it will damage the programs and the poor themselves. This (the subprofessional program) must be sold on the basis of the broad manpower needs in public service. You can't sell new careers as an alternate to welfare. You have to fight the welfare battle by itself." There are additional dangers in emphasizing dollar savings. For if subprofessionals are to be hired for significant roles at decent wages, it will undoubtedly increase the budgets of public service. Therefore, in principle, the majority considered that the main selling point should be the improved services with, as a subsidiary factor, the ultimate offsetting reductions in the social costs of dependency and neglect.

Much the same approach, the group felt, should be used in gaining increased support for the subprofessionals among the general public. Those directly served by subprofessionals must be convinced that they -- or in the case of education, their children -- are not receiving inferior services. In the past, those without standard qualifications were used as expedients because of shortages of personnel; they were looked on as something of a necessary evil. It was felt, therefore, as Dr. Letson put it, "There is a need for a psychological change in the attitudes toward non-certified personnel. One way to overcome this negative feeling is to emphasize that the subprofessionals are an added resource, and not a substitute for professional service."

Advancing the subprofessional concept as a positive rather than negative manpower use requires certain basic conditions, according to Mr. March. "The basic condition for acceptance in the long run, from the viewpoint of a hard-nosed budget man, is that the hiring of subprofessionals be productive and well worth the money spent. A strategy that insures subprofessional productivity has two basic elements: utilization as part of well organized teams in which they (the subprofessionals) support the professionals and at the same time gain intellectual sustenance from the teamwork that fosters their development; and a substantial allocation for in-service training."

Public acceptance alone is not enough. The vested interests - the professions and the unions -- also must be involved. Mr. Hamilton characterized this as a kind of politics: "not the derby-hatted and cigar type, but rather what can be called the mortar board and pipe politics which is nevertheless real." It was recognized that the myriad regulatory obstacles that exist -- credentials, certificates, licenses, etc. -- are designed and lobbied for by special interest groups.

Activities to gain the active support of the professional associations might include contact with their officers and staffs, urging them to devote time at annual meetings to the topic of manpower strategy and to disseminate information in all professional publications. The range of groups to be reached includes the associations of all levels of personnel in human-service employ and the appropriate unions. As one said, "The best way to overcome resistance is to give those who oppose the concept a piece of the action." Subprofessionals need a lobby but the support should be broadly based.

Although the primary leadership in developing support for subprofessionals was seen as devolving on management of public human-service organizations, there were some who were eager to commit the schools more deeply in this process, in line with building closer ties between earning and learning, as recommended in the recent Manpower Report of the President. According to Dr. Letson, "Attention is now being given to making the schools responsible for every pupil's next step, whether it be college, job, training, or a combination of work and study. If this were assumed as a part of the responsibility of public education, I am sure that it would have the most powerful effect on school curriculum in making sure that it was truly adapted to the needs of the individual pupils."

To fulfill this responsibility, it was thought, vocational education must be reshaped to relate to service occupations. And vocational programs will require larger funds than the already increased Federal allocations. The support for new vocational programs will have to be sought at the state and local level as well, where they currently suffer from a poor image. This image of vocational education as a watered-down curriculum for the poor student or as training for obsolete occupations is no longer accurate. "People think that the system is obsolete and that the old guard is still in charge," said Mr. Worthington, "and this is not true. There has been a revolution in vocational education in recent years, with 38 new state directors in office in the past two years. We have been unable to get the facts to the legislators, the Bureau of the Budget, and the people."

But despite the school's role, according to some, the school can only be successful in preparing youth for jobs if the jobs exist. Therefore a major share of responsibility for stimulating action must belong to the employers. Dr. Lieberman noted the importance of commitment on the part of top administrators when he said, "A major obstacle is the administrator who gives lip service to the development of subprofessionals but who is unwilling to take the needed steps to convert 10 aides into 10 occupational therapists. He would rather ask for the money for 10 new jobs." Without the leadership of employers, many thought, it will be difficult to infuse governmental bodies with the idea of supporting continuing education and reimbursed tuition. Mr. Hamilton suggested that "all employers should take the responsibility for seeing that their employees receive the training or academic education they need."

Only briefly touched on during the discussion was the possibility of involving employers in the private sector in both the practical and conceptual issues of subprofessional development and the potential value of an organization of the subprofessionals themselves. On the latter point there was no full agreement. Mr. Robinson, favoring such organization, said, "As an independent movement outside the traditional trade union structure, it could allow professionals and subprofessionals to be organized together. There are elements of social reform not now incorporated into labor unions. A new type of organization will not only attract new members but make a contribution towards getting more money by electing some sympathetic people." But some were skeptical of the possibilities for organization, questioning the value of a social movement centered around subprofessionals, especially as such a splinter group might cause jurisdictional disputes. And others saw it more likely that subprofessionals would ultimately be absorbed by existing labor unions. On balance, the group appeared to perceive a need for new selling arguments for the subprofessional, consistent with the enlarged and changed goals for their employment.

WORKSHOPS IV

RECRUITING, SELECTING, AND DEVELOPING SUBPROFESSIONALS

For each of the three fields, the basic "supply" questions were:

1. From what groups and by what methods should subprofessionals be recruited?
2. What personal attributes, work skills, and levels of formal education are required for subprofessional work, and how can candidates be selected to meet the criteria?
3. What kinds of training and supervision will best develop subprofessionals and how can they be established? Should training be pre-employment, post-employment, on-the-job, or off-the-job and formal? Or is a combination required and, if so, what should it be?
4. What is the role of educational institutions -- secondary schools (both general and vocational), junior colleges, and universities -- in develop-subprofessional personnel? How can curricula be established and integrated into a continuum spanning the various levels? How can education and job training be combined to devise new forms of accreditation that would include job experience?

Section A - Health   Chairman, Dr. Brown

General agreement was reached among the panelists concerning the need for an open recruitment policy which eliminated tests and other formal criteria and which set realistic hiring requirements. The current low wages for hospital workers, the majority also agreed, makes recruiting from all but the most disadvantaged groups extremely difficult. Until the pay is raised and the character of the jobs changed, recruitment sources are not going to alter substantially.

New techniques and sources of recruitment were suggested, however. Dr. Price pointed to the high schools as an obvious source, reinforcing his statement with the example of the Los Angeles high school - Kaiser-Permanente hospital cooperative work-study program, in which senior girls spent two hours each day at the hospital. He suggested that such a program might be developed nationally. The Neighborhood Youth Corps, it was noted by Mr. March, could also supply the job market with young people who are not college bound. But Mr. Davis declared that deprived youths will no longer take subprofessional jobs, that they are advised by their parents that welfare pays better than hospital custodial work. It is significant, said he, that the Los Angeles high-school program was open only to girls, who have no family to support. The reason that 80 percent of the hospital work force is female is that men will not work for $30 a week. Although Dr. Brown believed that recruitment was most effective in the neighborhood in which the facility is located, especially facilities for the disadvantaged, Mr. Grubb indicated that the poor prefer integrated institutions, feeling somehow short-changed by the presence of only local workers.

Beyond the entry-level jobs, it was agreed that a natural source was those already employed in unskilled or low-level work in hospitals. Recruitment need not be limited to this group but improving the upgrading opportunities for those already at work might be a potent factor in changing the image of health occupations. And an improved image in itself would facilitate further recruitment. Moreover, as several noted, for those already employed there are at least subjective measures of potential in supervisors' observations of worker interest, motivation, and ability to relate to the sick. Such subjective measures, although admittedly not entirely satisfactory, are of value when, as the group agreed, objective criteria are generally either inaccurate or discriminatory. Dr. Moed stressed the discriminatory quality of tests unless they are used to identify the need for remediation. He recommended work sampling tests as far preferable, and cautioned that "I hope we will not try to find at the outset the skills we think needed for two or three steps up the ladder."

In the absence of reliable instruments to predict potential capacity, the group appeared to consider training itself the best testing ground. Many were of the opinion that those registering for training were likely at least to have sufficient interest, and that satisfactory performance in training, although not a perfect measure of future capability, was more reliable than standard pre-employment methods. Mr. Davis suggested breaking down practical-nursing training and other health-training courses into various tracks and levels, thus insuring success in some part of the total training for a wider range of applicants.

A core program as the first stage of training for all health occupations stimulated considerable discussion. Dr. Brown favored a core of training in which all levels of staff could meet in common sessions on understanding the sick and which would familiarize all hospital workers with the myriad activities of a hospital, or at least with hospital vocabulary. Dr. Chope added that a core program could deal with interpersonal relationships, interviewing techniques, and bedside approaches. But some were skeptical of the merits of core training, suggesting that there was little common material for all health occupational training. Although the group as a whole did not endorse the core concept, they were aware, on the other hand, of the dangers of over-specializing training. As Mr. March said, "I am concerned with creating a bunch of additional little compartments. We need some arrangement by which someone who gets certified in one little box can easily move to another."

To provide for mobility, new forms of training, combining on-the-job experience and released-time formal training, Dr. Moed noted, would be necessary. Dr. Brown asserted that to develop unorthodox training and educational patterns, the professions and other groups outside the established professions must cooperate. One group that some participants felt should be involved is the nurses' aides themselves, to specify the kind of curriculum they see as needed. In general, there was agreement that a cross-section of ideas was vital to success. As Mr. Leff said, "We are talking about increases of hundreds of thousands of people in the next decade and the feeling is that the usual methods, or more of same, will not work."

If subprofessionals are to move to higher levels, not only must new training forms be devised, but educational institutions of all kinds must cooperate. Dr. Dunner made it clear that the V.A. hospitals, which are equipped to train thousands of health workers, can serve as a resource for vocational schools. Dr. Moed emphasized that training on the job is important because disadvantaged people cannot afford to stop working in order to go to school, even though, as Dr. Eller said, some outside academic training is necessary for upgrading. Such outside training, Dr. Chope asserted, can be achieved by scholarship assistance, much of which is either unknown or offered in a manner that is intimidating to disadvantaged people. It is imperative that counselors in all institutions encourage the poor to take advantage of scholarship opportunity. Beyond this, according to Mr. Hudson, it is completely possible to remain fully employed while studying, as exemplified by junior-college courses which include in-service training as part of the academic program. Dr. Brown added that hospital experience itself might provide much of the training necessary for middle-managerial jobs, work levels which, in Dr. Brown's opinion, offered promise. Promising as well, he noted, were the intermediary levels in dental hygiene and in ambulance attendance, in a capacity somewhat like that of medical corpsmen. For these latter, formal education would be needed, but for the managerial track only on-the-job training is indicated.

The consensus was that a new mix, combining job experience with outside training, is indicated. An auspicious undertaking in this direction, according to Dr. Brown, is the new Health Careers Institute sponsored by the City University of New York, of which Dr. Moed is the director. This institute will offer flexible training programs without cost to the employers.

The cost of training is a factor, all agreed. Mr. March suggested that training can be financed in several ways -- by passing it on as a cost of medical service, by Federal support in current programs under OEO and MDTA, or by new and broader public support. Training, to be adequate, will be expensive, but in the words of Mr. Grubb, "We are already paying the cost of not training in the cost of turnover, so the additional costs will not be that much."

On balance, the health workshop appeared to view training, or training in combination with formal education, as the major issue in supplying adequately productive subprofessional personnel and in developing subprofessional careers.

Section B - Education Chairman, Dr. Drachler

The panelists agreed in general that discussions of recruitment for subprofessionals in education at this point must be largely theoretical, since there is an abundance of applicants for any position offered. Furthermore, the existing jobs require little training, they said, and what is required is easily accomplished through orientation sessions or on the job.

At some future time, should the number and complexity of the jobs expand substantially, recruitment may become a more pressing necessity. At that point, the panelists thought, the goals will have to be established before the means of achieving them can be determined. It was anticipated that when the primary objective is to fill an urgent need for subprofessionals, the best potentials will exist among the poor and among those already employed in auxiliary capacities. Consequently, emphasizing recruiting among these groups, far from being an anti-poverty strategy, will be a manpower reality. Meanwhile, the jobs available are so vaguely defined and so little diversified that there is little basis for devising specific recruitment tactics for specific job requirements.

For the present, offering specific reasons why the poor should be absorbed into the labor market, Mr. Pragan remarked that since much legislation is enacted to fight poverty, it is logical to use the poverty-stricken themselves in the fight. "It is essential," he said, "to get the poor into the pool of subprofessional manpower, not by lowering standards but by increasing the capacity to train those with socio-economic handicaps." In expanding upon this, Dr. Brown pointed out that in New York City a career plan is being developed which will serve recruitment more realistically by creating entirely new jobs that will multiply more than tenfold in the near future. Both Dr. Dolce and Dr. Letson emphasized that the poor constitute the only truly available supply of labor.

Mr. Rosen, on the other hand, believed that the first target of recruitment should be those already employed, noting that the establishment of career and promotional possibilities raises the quality of those recruited. Miss Kemp remarked that health and educational institutions do not serve only the poor and that, "since 70 percent of school children do not go on to college, career planning and stimulation are essential for other than disadvantaged people."

In discussing recruiting methods, Mr. Woodruff suggested utilizing a wide range of community resources, representatives of minority groups, and, above all, the schools. Beyond this, both Dr. Brown and Dr. Drachler believed in cooperating with community organizations that are interested in recruiting subprofessionals, and in providing such organizations with staff and facilities to insure the fulfillment of the needs of education. Such groups, said Dr. Drachler, have arisen to fill a gap left by the schools.

But in order to employ subprofessionals effectively, the panel agreed, some selection criteria will have to be devised. The three obvious ones -- educational credentials, testing, and job performance, as listed by Dr. Ladd -- might sometimes, however, exceed the demands of the job. Dr. Drachler pointed out that if the subprofessional is not to be confined to non-instructional pursuits, some criteria must be established, although not necessarily, as Mr. Selden agreed, educational ones. And in this context, Dr. Drachler remarked that experience in Michigan gave evidence of poor correlation between test scores and performance. Dr. Ladd noted that all school personnel should have training. "I thought of on-the-job training, some years of work, and small amounts of education at any one time," he said. "I also think it very important that the school system should make some investment in educating its personnel. The school should have the resources to make such an investment so that they can have some control over the kind of education their employees get."

All the panelists recognized the obligation of the schools to provide vocational training of every sort, both in-service and formal, and that the combination, in Dr. Drachler's words, "must vary from job to job." Mrs. Alt pointed out that a pending amendment to Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act stipulated the provision of a well-developed training program when aides are employed. This amendment, she said, "may become law in six months and hopefully will be kept open for experimentation." But Dr. Dolce commented that "training need not always be a mix. It can be entirely on the job, especially in repetitive work. It all depends on the job construction..."

Concern was expressed about the source of funds for training and also about the necessity of complying with legislative rules for training. As Dr. Dolce said: "One fear I have is that the minute you begin a mandatory training program, you force schools to sit down and go through the motions of complying with the act. With the aide's role so undefined, it is difficult to develop meaningful training. I would suggest that at this point teachers should be charged with working with the apprentice in the traditional guild model." Dr. Drachler concurred, mentioning that plans should be made for training professionals to work with the aides. But he mentioned further that responsibility for training should belong equally to school systems and universities, so that "schools don't have to go with hat in hand to the universities." Dr. Ladd indicated his belief that the sterility of training teachers on campuses is clear. "We need to devise a plan," he insisted, "that takes into account the resources of the college and the school system as well as the weaknesses of each. It's not a matter of dividing the student, the resources, and the training in parts and giving some to the college and and some to on-the-job or interneship."

In sum, Dr. Drachler believed that better guidance and better curriculum development were indicated, and that the school must lead not only in these areas, but also in the area of communication with the community to dramatize the need for counseling. Some of the participants believed that curriculum can stimulate vocational interest, that careers in education can grow out of high-school-level courses. But in order to work toward a genuine career young people need early counseling in selection of courses. The schools must play this role, Dr. Drachler said, "because that is where the young people are."

Section C - Welfare Chairman, Mr. Andrew F. Juras, Administrator
Public Welfare Commission, State of Oregon

A major issue in this section was the connection between the manpower needs of public welfare agencies and the job needs of the poor, a linkage which some participants considered untenable, others considered eminently practicable, and still others saw as only theoretically acceptable. Implementation of such a connection was seen to be difficult, despite a social policy of giving preference to the poor, because current regulations such as civil service specifications restrict administrative action.

The problems of connecting manpower and anti-poverty considerations were clearest in the discussion of recruitment. Mr. Hursh stated, "Until now we have been approaching the manpower requirements of service institutions, which are never going to get enough professionals. Now we are talking about reaching the poorest. I see these as two problems. Maybe they are related, but I think that if I were going to focus on the poor I would recruit and train differently." Others noted that the poor are an overlooked reservoir of manpower. In the ensuing discussion the apparent consensus was expressed by Mr. Juras when he said, "The main thing is to structure the jobs so that the poor as well as others will have a fighting chance to get some of these jobs."

How to implement a recruitment and selection policy that provided the poor this "fighting chance" was a question central to the discussion. According to Dr. Riessman, "We cannot move on the assumption that we know what these jobs are going to be, what skills they will need, and how the jobs are to be organized. Until we know the answers to those questions, I think we have to recruit at random, without advance selection. We must provide opportunities to try people out, let them circulate around to see what work they are suited for. The crucial factor is training and not selection."

Mr. Robinson indicated that if Dr. Riessman's thesis were accepted, a specific problem had to be resolved. "We aren't tooled up legislatively," he said, "or tooled up with our civil service commissions; we're too bound by regulations to do this kind of random recruiting. This concept is unrealistic in terms of how we can be helped to work with our target population. Our laws are just not set up in this fashion." Mr. Juras added the question of budgetary limits. "I have so many positions in public welfare in Oregon, designated and phased in over a two-year period, and so many dollars per position. I can't hire 60 people and train them for random subprofessional roles. I must use the positions in my agency."

General understanding of these points was expressed, but some of the panelists warned not only against using "fancy techniques" but also against maintaining the artificial barriers that prohibit giving work to those who need it most. In this context, Mr. Aronson said, "There is a social decision to be made. Is it more important to take people off the relief rolls and get them jobs than it is to get the best people? There has been enough research over the last 50 years to establish individual differences in such things as manual dexterity, coordination, etc., but you may want to disregard this knowledge in order to assign a priority to those who need work most."

The dilemma here appeared to be that, although it is a national policy, expressed legislatively, to make jobs and training available on the basis of need, implementing this policy is difficult within permanent agency structures. Without special funds, agencies can provide neither the jobs nor the training. Furthermore, priorities are not clear. Should the agencies meet the legislative standards or the anti-poverty goals which, in any case, they are not designed to fulfill?

If, however, traditional selection methods are used, it was apparent to all that the poor would be excluded. Offering a precise example, Mr. Baldwin said, "We wanted to employ in the Department of Parks about 150 men on relief, but they all flunked the civil service requirements because they had police records, were in bad health, or had poor job stability. If your objective is to rid the relief rolls of people," he went on, "the only group we have are women. At the moment I have no more than 100 men on relief rolls -- and they are there only temporarily -- and I have 5300 women."

Mr. Carleton proposed recruiting generally, plus a core training program, eventuating in self-selective recruitment. "For instance," said he, "someone who is not athletic will not apply for a job as a recreation aide. But this assumes a range of jobs to fill and a certain degree of coordination in a municipality."

Selection policies, as Dr. Riessman suggested, might also include rotation, thus allowing subprofessionals to move laterally if not always vertically. Those considered unemployable are so in fact if job structuring is to remain traditional. If a maximum number of the disadvantaged are to be put to work, job structure must be altered. Dr. Nixon considered that the schools and training programs could play a role in recruitment and selection. "We have not only not geared youth towards public service," he said, "but we have actually geared them away from it. Vocational education is usually related to some aspect of private industry rather than to public service, and this is true also of MDTA. In the New York City programs, the non-profit slots have been mostly of six-months duration, and then off the kids go to the private sector. And so far as the adult ghetto population is concerned, there are hundreds of unemployed males, in spite of the fact that they have the capacity to do the jobs that need to be done."

Although knotty problems were presented by recruitment and selection, equally knotty were the problems of training. Some of the panelists opted for minimal amounts of pre-job training and far more on-the-job training, with many of the high-school equivalency and college credits also to be supplied during employment.

Some participants felt that by imaginative use of existing Federal legislation training could be developed. Mr. Juras agreed that under Title V and also under the Community Work and Training clause of AFDC legislation, thousands of people had been given both on-the-job and formal training, running the gamut from basic literacy training to college level work. "We found the community colleges a marvelous resource for developing welding and lab technicians, registered nurses, and the like." He noted, however, that welfare agencies had provided more training leading towards jobs in other fields of work than for their own, and that perhaps workers should be trained for welfare service jobs. Mr. Steininger said, "We hope to change the Community Work and Training funding. The limitation is that you don't get any Federal matching for the expenses of training and supervision."

Further discussion centered on the role of education, the part to be played by urban universities, professional schools, and community colleges, as well as by secondary education, in developing subprofessional potential as a manpower resource. But, it was asked, will the colleges or schools assume responsibility for the drop-out or the out-of-school youth or adults? The fact is, as Mr. Robinson insisted, "We in welfare have these kids on our hands. Many of them come from our families." And it was generally acknowledged that public welfare itself must accept some responsibility for initiating the kinds of training and education their clients or prospective employees need.

Vocational education might supply an answer, some participants thought. "Our superintendent is going to go all the way with us in Voc. Ed. programs," Mr. Ellis declared. Some, on the other hand, observed that their local school boards are not interested in vocational education for people on welfare. School commitment varies with the community; in some places the schools refuse to play a role in training because they feel they cannot accredit those trained on the job. As one participant said, "We in welfare have to set up basic education, literacy, and high-school equivalency programs because the schools don't want to do it. Individual school districts are a law unto themselves. If they don't want to do it they don't have to." The belief was that many schools will not make an investment in people considered untrainable.

In the long run, however, as Mr. Steininger pointed out, it is important to decide where the responsibility lies. "I'd like to see welfare assume the leadership role," he said, "but they will tell me that they already have too many other problems." The general view was, as one participant said, "Although welfare alone cannot move the world, there is a lot we can do."

CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

MISS MARY P. ALLEN, Director, Public Information
American Vocational Association, Washington, D.C.

WENDELL C. ALLEN, Assistant Superintendent
Teacher Education & Certification, State of Washington

MRS. TERRY ALT, Program Officer
Bureau of Elementary & Secondary Education
U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C.

MISS FLORENCE ANDERSON, Secretary, Carnegie Corporation
New York City

ALBERT H. ARONSON, Director, Division of State Merit Systems
U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

JOSEPH E. BALDWIN, Director, Department of Public Welfare
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

MARK BATTLE, Deputy Director, Bureau of Work Programs
U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.

HOWARD J. BROWN, M.D., Administrator, Health Services Administration
New York City

NATHAN BROWN, Deputy Executive Superintendent of Schools
New York City

CHARLES CARLETON, Legislative Assistant to Congressman James H. Scheuer
Washington, D.C.

HAROLD O. CHOPE, M.D., Director, Department of Health & Welfare
San Mateo County, California

JOSEPH COSAND, President, St. Louis Community College District
Clayton, Missouri

LEON J. DAVIS, President, Drug & Hospital Employees Union
Local 1199, New York City

ALVA R. DITTRICK, Deputy Superintendent of Schools
Cleveland, Ohio

CARL DOLCE, Superintendent of Schools
Orleans Parish, New Orleans, Louisiana

NORMAN DRACHLER, Superintendent of Schools
Detroit, Michigan

EDWARD DUNNER, M.D., Special Assistant to Assistant Chief Medical Director
Research & Education, Veterans Administration
Washington, D.C.

C. HOWE ELLER, M.D., Commissioner of Health
St. Louis County, Clayton, Missouri

WELLBORN R. ELLIS, Administrator, Department of Family & Child Services
Fulton County, Atlanta, Georgia

MRS. MILDRED EPSTEIN, Divisional Administrative Assistant
Ford Foundation, New York City

THOMAS J. FRAWLEY, Associate Administrator, University Hospital
New York City

VICTOR GOTBAUM, Director, District Council #37
American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees
New York City

LESTER GRANT, MD., Associate Professor of Medicine
New York University School of Medicine
Career Scientist, Health Research Council, New York City

GEORGE GRUBB, General Personnel Manager
City of San Francisco, California

RANDY HAMILTON, Executive Director
Institute of Local Self Governments, Berkeley, California

ROBERT HERMAN, Division of Adult & Vocational Research
U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C.

JAY HUDSON, Assistant to the Director
Mt. Zion Hospital & Medical Center, San Francisco, California

MORRIS HURSH, Commissioner of Public Welfare
State of Minnesota

ANDREW F. JURAS, Administrator, Public Welfare Commission
State of Oregon

MISS BARBARA KEMP, Program Specialist, Vocational & Technical Education
U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C.

MRS. ELIZABETH D. KOONTZ, Vice-President and President-Elect
National Education Association, Washington, D.C.

EDWARD T. LADD, Director, Teacher Education
Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia

SAM LEFF, Chief, Standards Division
U.S. Civil Service Commission, Washington, D.C.

JOHN W. LETSON, Superintendent of Schools
Atlanta, Georgia

EUGENE LEVINE, M.D., Division of Nursing, Bureau of Health Manpower
U.S. Public Health Service, Bethesda, Maryland

DANIEL LIEBERMAN, M.D., Commissioner of Mental Health
State of Delaware

NORMAN V. LOURIE, Executive Deputy Secretary of Public Welfare
State of Pennsylvania

MICHAEL S. MARCH, Assistant Chief
Division of Education, Manpower and Science
U.S. Bureau of the Budget, Washington, D.C.

LAWRENCE B. McARTHUR, Assistant Commissioner for Manpower
Department of Mental Hygiene, State of New York

JAMES C. McDONALD, Associate Director
New Careers Training Laboratory, New York City

CHARLES A MEYER, Secretary - Chief Examiner
Detroit Civil Service Commission, Detroit, Michigan

S.M. MILLER, Program Advisor, Office of Social Development
Ford Foundation, New York City

MARTIN MOED, Associate Dean, City University
New York City

RUSSELL A. NIXON, Director
Institutes & Curriculum Development Center for Study of Unemployed Youth
New York City

RICHARD L. OLANOFF, Director of Job Training
Manpower Utilization Commission, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

MRS. ERSA POSTON, President, Civil Service Commission
State of New York

OTTO PRAGAN, Assistant Director, Department of Education, AFL-CIO
Washington, D.C.

WILLIAM R. PRICE, JR., Vice-President, Kaiser Foundation School of Nursing
Oakland, California

ROBERT QUINN, Director of Recruitment, Civil Service Department
State of New York

FRANK RIESSMAN, Professor of Educational Sociology
Director, New Careers Development Center, New York University
New York City

WILLIAM H. ROBINSON, Director, Cook County Department of Public Aid
Chicago, Illinois

SUMNER ROSEN, Education Director, District Council #37
American Federation State, County and Municipal Employees
New York City

EDWIN ROSINSKI, Special Assistant to Assistant Secretary
Health & Scientific Affairs Department
Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Bethesda, Maryland

EDWIN RUMPF, Chief, State Vocational Services Branch
U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C.

MISS ROZELLA M. SCHLOTFELDT, Dean, Frances Payne Bolton School of Nursing
Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio

DAVID SELDEN, Assistant to the President, American Federation of Teachers
Chicago, Illinois

BRENDAN SEXTON, Director of Training, Citizens Crusade Against Poverty
Washington, D.C.

MISS NANCY SINKIN, Special Assistant to the Commissioner
Department of Welfare, New York City

FRED H. STEININGER, Director, Bureau of Family Services
Welfare Administration, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare
Washington, D.C.

A. NICHOLS TAYLOR, Associate Secretary, Council on Medical Education
American Medical Association, Chicago, Illinois

FERNANDO G. TORGERSON, Staff Consultant on Manpower Study & Development
National Association of Social Workers, New York City

ISADORE TUERK, M.D., Commissioner of Mental Hygiene
State of Maryland

ABRAHAM WILNER, Assistant Superintendent of Schools
New York City

ROBERT WOODRUFF, Associate Director for Personnel, Board of Education
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

ROBERT M. WORTHINGTON, Assistant Commissioner of Education
State of New Jersey

BERNARD M. YABROFF, Chief, Employment Opportunities Branch
Division of Adult & Vocational Research, U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS BY THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OF YOUTH RELATING TO THE SUBPROFESSIONAL

The CAP Aide Study. Judith G. Benjamin, Edith F. Lynton, et al. A study in four sections dated December, 1965; April, June, and September, 1966

Pros and Cons: New Roles for Nonprofessionals in Corrections. Judith G. Benjamin, Marcia K. Freedman, and Edith F. Lynton. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1966

A Demonstration on-the-Job Training Program for Semi-Professional Personnel in Youth Employment Programs. Seymour Lesh, Deborah Lesser, et al. Two reports, December, 1965 and July, 1967.

Source Book for Neighborhood Aides in Community Action Programs. Prepared by the Curriculum Development Project of NCEY. Seymour Lesh, Project Director, July, 1967

A Guide for Training Neighborhood Workers in a Community Action Agency. Prepared by the Curriculum Development Project of NCEY. Seymour Lesh, Project Director, July, 1967

An Annotated Bibliography on Subprofessionals. Prepared by the Curriculum Development Project of NCEY. Seymour Lesh, Project Director, July, 1967

"The New Nonprofessional." American Child, Vol. 49, Winter, 1967, No.1. (Articles by Frank Riessman, Mitchell Ginsberg, Sherman Barr, Mark Battle, and Edith F. Lynton.)

Selected articles in

New Generation. (formerly American Child) Published quarterly by NCEY.

Youth and Work. A newsletter on projects, programs, publications. Published by NCEY.

NCEY STAFF FOR THE CONFERENCE

Eli E. Cohen, Executive Secretary
Joel Seldin, Associate Executive Secretary
Edith F. Lynton, Conference Director
Mildred Asten Safar, Conference Coordinator
Evelyn T. Strouse, Editorial Consultant
Evelyn Wiener, Secretary

Recording by:

Jonathan Clive
Andrew E. Lynton
Jonathan Lynton
Alexander Seldin